

CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15
(legislative day of March 4), 1940*

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

William P. Upshur to be major general.
Lloyd L. Leech to be colonel.
Samuel A. Woods, Jr., to be colonel.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Bryan Whitehurst, Abbeville.
Una B. Bowden, Arifton.
Robert B. Evans, Elkmont.
Robert H. Reid, Elmore.
Robert Gaston Bozeman, Evergreen.
Louie Glenn Collier, Huntsville.
James F. Freeman, Sr., Phenix City.

CALIFORNIA

Ford E. Samuel, Alameda.

CONNECTICUT

James M. Tomney, Cos Cob.
Philip T. Lewis, East Killingly.
Martin W. Sinnott, New Hartford.
Walter G. Barker, Niantic.
Frank P. Ablondi, Stony Creek.

GEORGIA

Irene McLeod, Abbeville.
Lucius Hannon, Atco.
Elizabeth H. Quinn, Barnesville.
Martha C. Aultman, Byron.
Jesse S. Weathers, Cairo.
Estelle G. Pierce, Chamblee.
Marcus Watson Miller, Colquitt.
Telford M. Oliver, Franklin Springs.
Mae W. Dukes, Gibson.
Ivey M. Cox, Newton.
John Stanley Newton, Norman Park.
Grover C. Alston, Richland.
William H. Brock, Trenton.
Jesse W. Slade, Zebulon.

INDIANA

James Frank Durr, Sheridan.

IOWA

Ethel M. Knudson, Lytton.

MISSOURI

Edwin A. Williams, Boonville.
Birdie Lee See, Corder.
Adrian A. Fults, Crystal City.
John E. Davis, Eureka.
Roy Carter Hendren, Hamilton.
William H. Kendrick, La Belle.
Elton C. Cook, Lathrop.
William H. Nanney, Marble Hill.
Kathryn Barry, Mendon.
Phares K. Weis, Moberly.
William G. Nunnally, New Florence.
Emmett H. Bond, Osceola.
Roy Cooper, Puxico.
Edna E. Saunders, Stewartsville.

NEW JERSEY

Sam Epstein, Lake Hiawatha.
Victor R. Keller, Northfield.
Curtis J. Gray, Pine Beach.

NEW YORK

Lillian P. Rock, Bloomingdale.
Henry J. Rourke, Gansevoort.

OREGON

Harry L. Price, Aloha.
Florence N. Pearson, Timber.

PENNSYLVANIA

Watson W. Wright, Andalusia.
Emilie D. Stoneback, Black Lick.
J. Russell Clayton, Bryn Athyn.
C. William Boozer, Centre Hall.
Silverius A. Waltman, Chicora.
Charles H. Reisinger, Dallastown.
Joseph J. Quinn, Gallitzin.
James J. O'Mara, Laceyville.
Virginia G. Kingsley, Pleasantville.
Cliffe A. Benjamin, Rices Landing.
William C. Salberg, Ridgway.

VIRGINIA

William A. White, Arrington.
Bernice E. Utz, Barboursville.
Daniel W. Buckley, Jr., Clifton Station.
Bernard P. Nearhood, Jewell Ridge.
William F. Shipe, Middletown.
Lois Hurt, Tazewell.

WASHINGTON

George Janssen, Bellingham.
William C. Pearson, Ocean Park.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fred Gainer, Parkersburg.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who art of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and hast promised forgiveness to all those who confess and forsake their sins: We come before Thee realizing our unworthiness, acknowledging our manifold transgressions, and beseeching Thy mercy and pardon. Grant us Thy grace and protection for the ensuing day; keep us temperate in all things, and diligent in our service to our country; help us to be true to our ideals and upright in our dealings with each other, full of compassion and ready to do good to all men according to our abilities and opportunities.

Incline our hearts to keep Thy righteous law; and in every decision that we shall be called upon to make in these momentous days, in the strife of truth with falsehood, grant that we may never betray, deny, or forsake the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord, whose cross of love alone can save a sorrowing, sin-sick world, and in whose name we offer up these, our imperfect prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Friday, March 15, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HOMER T. BONE, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On March 14, 1940:

S. 1449. An act for the relief of George Stockman;

S. 2157. An act for the relief of George H. Eiswald;

S. 2276. An act for the relief of the R. G. Schreck Lumber Co.;

S. 2843. An act granting easements on Indian Lands of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., for dam site and reservoir purposes in connection with the Riverton reclamation project;

S. 2866. An act to provide for allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for examination and treatment; and

S. 3012. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purpose," approved July 1, 1902 (52 Stat. 662), relative to the payment of the commuted rations of enlisted men.

On March 15, 1940:

S. 547. An act to amend section 23 of the act of March 4, 1909, relating to copyrights;

S. 1088. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exchange certain property located at Veterans' Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., title to which is now vested in the United States, for certain property of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute;

S. 2152. An act to protect scenic values along the Catalina Highway within the Coronado National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 2740. An act to amend section 9a, National Defense Act, as amended, so as to provide specific authority for the employment of warrant officers of the Regular Army as agents of officers of the finance department for the disbursement of public funds;

S. 2769. An act to amend section 55, National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for enlistment of men up to 45 years of age in technical units of the Enlisted Reserve Corps;

S. 2879. An act to authorize the posthumous appointment of the late Arthur Mortimer Fields, Jr., to be an ensign of the United States Navy;

S. 2973. An act for the relief of Inez Gillespie;

S. 2992. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States at Quantico, Va.; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution creating a commission to arrange for the celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the signing of the first United States patent law.

LOTS IN HARDING TOWN SITE, FLORIDA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 164)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 538, a bill for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida.

It is the purpose of this bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to any person who, as a result of an auction sale of lots in Harding town site, Florida, conducted during February 1924, agreed to purchase a lot in such town site and who (1) prior to the date of approval of this act, has paid to the United States 75 percent or more of the agreed purchase price of such lot, or (2) within 12 months after the date of approval of this act makes payment to the United States which, together with payments previously made, amounts to 75 percent of the agreed purchase price of such lot.

Approval of the bill would relieve the purchasers of 71 lots in the Harding town site of paying into the Federal Treasury approximately \$52,000, representing the final installment due and payable more than 10 years ago. When the 133 lots in this town site were offered for sale in 1924, 128 were purchased. None of the purchasers paid in cash. All elected to pay one-fourth of the bid price in cash and the balance in three equal installments, 1, 2, and 3 years after the date of sale. The purchasers of 57 lots have completed payments aggregating \$179,770.

While the appraisal for these lots in 1924 was only \$59,000, the purchasers entered into binding contracts for paying to

the United States a sum several times more than the then appraised value. It is to be assumed that the purchasers had assured themselves that the lots were worth the amount they contracted to pay. The controversy concerning this legislation led the Secretary of the Interior to have the property reappraised by three local independent appraisers. This new appraisal made as of May 5, 1938, less than 2 years ago, placed the fair value of the 128 lots at \$575,800. According to this appraisal, the 57 lots were valued at \$297,150, and the 71 lots affected by this bill were appraised at \$278,650, as compared with a purchase price of \$208,775. Thus according to this appraisal the value of the lots on which payments are due is \$69,875 in excess of the contract price.

While it is true that some of the purchasers who have not made full payment for their lots contracted to pay more than their value as indicated by the 1938 appraisal, a substantial majority of the purchasers who still owe balances on their lots will, according to the same appraisal, have a value greater than the contract price, even though the full amount is paid. In some instances the appraised value is three or four times greater than the contract price. Moreover, approval of this bill would discriminate against those who have paid the entire contract price on their lots and in favor of those who have been delinquent.

No good reason appears for relieving the purchasers of the obligations which they assumed many years ago. They have not been required to pay interest on the deferred payments, and it is my understanding that no taxes have been collected on these lots.

In the circumstances, I am compelled to withhold my approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 18, 1940.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Russell
Ashurst	Downey	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	Ellender	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Frazier	Lundeen	Sheppard
Bankhead	George	McCarran	Shipstead
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Smith
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Bridges	Guffey	Mead	Taft
Brown	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tobey
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Townsend
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Tydings
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Walsh
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Davis	La Follette	Reynolds	Wiley

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930, which, with the

accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified volume comprising the acts of the second special session of the Fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, 1939, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the convention of the California State Council of Carpenters at San Jose, Calif., protesting against the continuation of public-building projects under the supervision of the W. P. A. rather than under the P. W. A., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the president of the board of directors of Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District, No. 6, Los Fresnos, Tex., praying for the enactment of the so-called West bill, for the conservation of flood waters of the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at a regional conference of the W. C. T. U. of Minnesota and North Dakota at Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring peace and keeping the United States out of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Social Justice and Civil Liberties Council of the Community Church, of Boston, Mass., and the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of pending antialien legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of Union Chapter, No. 525, State, City, Municipal Workers of America, of the Bronx, New York, protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 3046) to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Southern California District, No. 4, Maritime Federation of the Pacific, San Pedro, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the Secretary of War, in the interest of the national defense, to make a survey of the proposed T-tunnel as a means of communication between San Pedro, Wilmington, Terminal Island, and Long Beach, Calif., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOLT presented a resolution of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the proposed construction of dams at Letart, W. Va., and Greenup, Ky., and also the installation of hydroelectric power facilities at these sites, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a paper in the nature of a petition of the post officers' area conference of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, meeting in Sistersville, W. Va., representing Wheeling, Moundsville, McMechen, Weirton, Cameron, New Martinsville, Wellsburg, Follansbee, Benwood, Pine Grove, Hundred, Weston, Buckhannon, Clarksburg, Lumberport, West Union, Shinnston, Gassaway, Salem, Parkersburg, Spencer, Point Pleasant, Glenville, Middlebourne, Elizabeth, Sistersville, St. Marys, Grantsville, Pennsboro, Ripley, and Ravenswood, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to acquire additional ground for the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BROWN presented resolutions adopted at the Women's City Club, Detroit, Mich., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED ON FEBRUARY 15, 1940, AT THE WOMEN'S CITY CLUB, DETROIT, MICH.

Whereas in the State of Michigan there exist several laws which discriminate against women in the economic, political, and civil fields; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that such restrictive legislation for women, alone, does not violate the Constitution; and

Whereas it is necessary to tirelessly fight proposed legislation which discriminates against women in every session of Congress and the Michigan Legislature, while the equal-rights amendment is buried in the Judiciary Committee of both the Senate and House of Representatives; and

Whereas the only permanent vehicle to prevent such invasions of fundamental rights is a constitutional amendment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Michigan branch of the National Woman's Party demands as a simple matter of justice to the women citizens of the United States that the equal-rights amendment be favorably reported immediately to both Houses of Congress and by them submitted to the people of the country for ratification; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the Michigan branch of the National Woman's Party to the chairmen and the members of the Judiciary Committee of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the Michigan delegation in Congress individually.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7079) to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6480) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1325) thereon.

Mr. BULOW, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 3368) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and other retirement acts, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1326) thereon.

Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5784) to provide for the conservation and transfer of accumulated sick leave and vacation time due classified civil-service employees who succeed to the position of postmaster, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1327) thereon.

REPORT OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF (S. DOC. NO. 165)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the report of proceedings of the Thirty-first meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held at Berkeley, Calif., June 18 to 20, 1939, reported it with the recommendation that it be printed as a Senate Document; and, on motion by Mr. HAYDEN, it was

Ordered, That the report of proceedings of the thirty-first meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held at Berkeley, Calif., June 18 to 20, 1939, be printed as a document.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Henry C. Walthour, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John E. Sloan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 3601. A bill to authorize the use for general road and trail construction purposes of the unexpended balance of funds

paid by the city and county of San Francisco to the United States for road and trail construction purposes in Yosemite National Park, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 3602. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to all postmasters who have rendered at least 40 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 3603. A bill for the relief of Howland & Waltz Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3604. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. MILLER introduced Senate bill 3605, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3606. A bill for the relief of C. L. Newcomb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3607. A bill to authorize research by the Public Health Service relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 3608. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

S. 3609. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Columbia River and its tributaries in Clark County, Wash., extending from the downstream point of the Vancouver Lake area to the upstream point of the Bachelor Island area, a distance of approximately 3 miles, with a view to providing flood control for said area; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for himself and Mr. STEWART):

S. 3610. A bill to authorize the use of Tennessee Valley Authority funds for alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3611. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the regulations made pursuant thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 3612. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to accept, as loans, from States, and political subdivisions thereof, funds to be immediately used in the prosecution of authorized flood-control work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 3613. A bill for the relief of Inez Smith (with accompanying papers); and

S. 3614. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 3615. A bill to admit the American-owned steamship *Port Saunders* and steamship *Hawk* to American registry and to permit their use in coastwise and fisheries trade; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 3616. A bill to amend the records at the port of New York to show the admission of Steve Zegura, Jr., and B. Dragomir Zegura as aliens admitted for permanent residence; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 3617. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the Ohio River Drainage Basin; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 3618. A bill making appropriation for additional research in respect to the effects of the present wars upon agriculture, for the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 3619. A bill relating to changes in the administration of the National Guard of the United States bearing on Federal recognition, pay, allotment of funds, drill, training, and so forth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to determine the feasibility of extending the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation to the Southern States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

BRANCH BANKS AND OFFICES OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to restrict the establishment of branch offices by financial institutions, and so forth, and request that a statement accompanying the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3605) to restrict the establishment of branch offices by financial institutions chartered or insured under the laws of the United States, was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and the statement above referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill does not interfere with the legal branch banks that are now in existence but does prevent the organization or establishment of any other branch banks. It preserves the status quo of such existing institutions. The bill, if enacted, will prevent the establishment of any branch offices hereafter by all financial institutions chartered by or pursuant to any law enacted by the Congress, or any financial institution whose shares, accounts, investments, or deposits are insured to any extent by the United States or any agency or instrumentality of the United States.

The bill is designed to protect the existing banking system and to preserve the independent bank as a vital force in our economic system. The present trend toward branch banking is pronounced. In 1920 only 4 percent of all banking offices belonged to branch systems, as compared with 24 percent in 1938.

On April 29, 1938, the President of the United States transmitted a message to the Congress in which he recommended the strengthening and enforcement of the antitrust laws. In that report, at page 8, he said:

"It is hardly necessary to point out the great economic power that might be wielded by groups which may succeed in acquiring domination of banking resources in any considerable area of the country. That power becomes particularly dangerous when it is exercised from a distance and notably so when effective control is maintained without the responsibilities of complete ownership."

It is thought by many citizens that it is necessary to stop the trend toward branch banking, and this bill is designed for that purpose; but it will not disturb the operation of the banks now in existence.

CENSUS OF 1940

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent by him to the President of the United States on March 15, relative to the census of 1940, a letter from Hon. Harry L. Hopkins and Senator TOBEY's reply thereto, as well as several editorials, which appear in the Appendix.]

FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the occasion of the forty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Volunteers of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE BEFORE CHARITABLE IRISH SOCIETY

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LODGE before the Charitable Irish Society in Boston, Mass., March 16, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM SENATOR SMATHERS TO PRESIDENT OF NEW JERSEY STATE ASSEMBLY ON PRESIDENTIAL THIRD TERM RESOLUTION

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Senator SMATHERS to the president of the New Jersey House of Assembly relative to a resolution passed by the house of assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation to prevent any President from seeking a third term, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS ON RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD a radio address by Senator LUCAS on the Ameri-

can Forum of the Air Sunday, March 17, 1940, discussing the reciprocal-trade agreements, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER ON RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on the American Forum of the Air on March 17, 1940, on the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements, which appears in the Appendix.]

WIRE TAPPING

[Mr. ASHURST asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Attorney General of the United States of March 19, 1940, and a statement by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of March 13, 1940, on the subject of wire tapping, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY BEFORE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Postmaster General Farley at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick held at the Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C., March 16, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPINION OF JUDGE PARKER IN NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AGAINST HIGHLAND PARK MANUFACTURING CO.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the opinion of Senior Circuit Judge Parker, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in the case of National Labor Relations Board against Highland Park Manufacturing Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the renewal of the reciprocal trade treaty powers written by Edward H. Snyder and published in the Picoche (Nev.) Lincoln County Independent of Thursday, March 14, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CECIL F. BATES ON FEDERAL TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of Federal taxation of municipal bonds delivered on March 8, 1940, by Cecil F. Bates, mayor of Mobile, Ala., at the Southern Regional Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors, held at Birmingham, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY DR. JOHN J. WICKER, PRESIDENT OF FORK UNION MILITARY ACADEMY, VIRGINIA

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dr. John J. Wicker, president of the Fork Union Military Academy, Virginia, entitled "Is It a Crime to Have a Dollar?" which appears in the Appendix.]

PREPARING COERCION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, March 15, 1940, entitled "Preparing Coercion," which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORITY VESTED IN GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

[Mr. MILLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the El Dorado (Ark.) Daily News of March 13, 1940, dealing with the authority vested in Government bureaus, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES ON REGULATION OF INVESTMENT TRUSTS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of March 16, 1940, relative to the regulation of investment trusts, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF ANTIPERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3046) to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the

act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate took a recess last Friday the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] had offered an amendment and asked that it be pending. The Senate understood that the Senator's amendment was pending. The Chair understands that the Senator's amendment is to an amendment which has been adopted by the Senate. In order to consider that amendment to the amendment which has been adopted, the Senator must get unanimous consent to offer the amendment, or a motion must be made and carried to reconsider the amendment adopted by the Senate.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in order to avoid the difficulty stated by the Chair, I offer my amendment as a new section and number it 12½. In the circumstances, neither reconsideration nor unanimous consent will be necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator offers his amendment as a new section.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask that it be reported by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be stated as a new section.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section, to be known as section 12½, to read as follows:

No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any officer or employee embraced by this section to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, by virtue of the Bankhead amendment, we have protected the wealthy against all demands of the politicians for campaign contributions in excess of \$5,000.

The pending amendment, if adopted and enacted, will completely protect all employees who are within the purview of the bill against the State machines which are now plundering them of a part of their compensation for factional and political purposes. It will deal a death blow to the indefensible 2-percent political clubs of West Virginia. Under their operation an employee who has earned but \$3.50 in a whole month is compelled to pay 7 cents tribute to the State political machine in order to obtain his check.

If the Senate adopts this amendment, it will thereby assure the relief which I seek to obtain for the people of West Virginia, and the request for a vote on my proposed substitute for the bill will be withdrawn.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. I was absent from the Senate most of Saturday afternoon. Is there a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a specified time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will vote at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I desire to be heard on the amendment briefly. I have been voting against amendments because I felt the Senate was fairly evenly divided on what I believed to be a filibuster against the bill, and while I have no fault to find with those who engage in filibusters, because I have often been guilty of it myself, however, when I was on the side trying to break a filibuster, there were two things I considered very important. One was to keep quiet and compel the others to do all the talking. The second was to vote against any amendment which might be offered.

Candidly, I confess I did not give the consideration to some of the amendments offered to the pending bill which I would have given to amendments under any other circumstances. But now we have agreed to vote at a specified time, and I feel just a little different about amendments. It cannot be charged that one is filibustering, and in the nature of things a filibuster cannot exist where a definite time has been fixed for a vote.

I cannot see anything wrong with the amendment just offered. In fact, it seems to me to be a good amendment. It seems to me that it strikes at one of the evils which we desire to cure, and I do not see why anyone who is in favor of the pending legislation cannot conscientiously vote for the amendment. I feel like voting for it unless some good reason can be given why I should not. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, he is really trying to carry out the fundamental purposes of the measure now before us.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. HATCH. As I have understood the amendment from his explanation of it, it is my intention to vote for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I ask to have reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add the following new section at the end of the bill:

Sec. 16. All officers and employees of the United States affected by the provisions of this act, as approved August 2, 1939, and by this or any amendments thereto, shall, on the date of the approval of this act, be covered into the civil service, and entitled to all the rights, privileges, immunities, and safeguards now accorded by law to officers and employees of the United States now in civil service.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk proposes a new section to the bill, to apply only to Federal employees affected by the Hatch Act, or any who might be affected by the pending amendment to the Hatch Act. It merely provides that from the date the amendment shall go into effect all Federal employees affected by the so-called Hatch Act and the proposed amendment shall be covered into the civil service, and shall enjoy all the rights, privileges, and safeguards of the civil service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many employees would be affected?

Mr. MINTON. I am advised there are about 271,000. It must be remembered that those who are affected by the Hatch Act, and who would be affected by the amendment now pending, if any would be caught under the amendment—a matter as to which I cannot state definitely—are denied the right to take any part at all in politics, and fight for the jobs they hold, while someone on the outside who might want one of the jobs, who might want the political party in power to fail, is at liberty to do anything he desires to do, in a political way, in order to get one of the jobs, or to defeat the party in power. The amendment I have offered would merely provide that those, who have had taken away from them the right to participate in politics at all, shall have the same safeguards the civil-service employees have.

We have heard much about the civil-service employees in the course of the debate and how they have been under the ban not to take part in politics. What I am seeking to apply to those who come under the Hatch Act is the same thing the civil-service employees have been under for 50 years. If it is good for them to stay out of politics, and be rewarded by being secure in their jobs, not being kicked out without a trial, and having pensions provided for them, then, since we take away from those who are affected by the Hatch Act the right to participate in politics at all, why should we not give them the same safeguards we give those who are in the civil service, provide that they may have their jobs for life, except, of course, as they may be removed for cause, and that they cannot be removed unless they have a trial, just as anyone in the civil service is entitled to a trial. After they have served

their time and have given their lives to the service, they should be retired with pensions, just as are the others in civil service.

Will some Senator stand on the floor—and I will yield in my time, brief as it is—and tell me why, in justice and fairness, those who are placed under the ban of taking part in politics under the Hatch Act should not have all the benefits of the civil service which the civil-service employees, who are under the same ban, now have? The Senator from New Mexico is simply applying the civil-service ban to those who are in politics, taking them out of politics; but he is not giving them any of the safeguards employees in civil service have enjoyed for 50 years. So I say that in fairness to those who are being muzzled, in fairness to those from whom is being taken the right to participate in politics, we should give them the same so-called safeguards which are given other employees in civil service.

Mr. President, that is all there is to the amendment; and I should like to hear any Senator give a good reason why these employees should not be under civil service. There is not a thing to it except an attempt to be fair to employees to whom the act is to be applied, to be as fair to them as to other "dehorned" employees in the civil service. They cannot take any part in politics, but they get a benefit in the way of security of position, in the way of pensions, and all that sort of thing. There is no use taking the time of the Senate in further discussing the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is pretty good for the Federal employees, but how about the State employees? What is the Senator proposing to do for them?

Mr. MINTON. That is a bigger problem, and it was a little too difficult for me to reach with a simple amendment. I do not know whether they can be reached or not, but if that problem is to be reached, it would have to be reached by an amendment which would require a great deal more study and consideration than I was able to give to the matter. But the amendment I have offered is a simple one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The House of Representatives has passed a civil-service bill providing that certain employees not now in the civil service shall be qualified for the civil service, and I am told that that bill is being considered by the Senate Committee on Civil Service, or will be within the next few days. It seems to me that any measure covering a great many employees, hundreds of thousands of them, into the civil service, should receive the consideration of a committee which is familiar with the subject. It seems to me that one of the troubles is that attempting to reach this question by an amendment to the pending bill, without any consideration being given it by the committee charged with the consideration of that kind of legislation, is more or less like going up a blind alley on this subject. It might include many employees the Civil Service Committee would never report as being entitled to go under civil service. If such legislation is to be given the careful consideration it should receive—and I am sympathetic with it, I will say to the Senator—I doubt whether it should be attempted as an amendment to the pending bill. I should like to know the Senator's reaction to the situation, in view of the fact that the Committee on the Civil Service is considering a bill involving a kindred subject.

Mr. MINTON. This amendment is quite simple. These employees are now being told that they shall not take part in politics. I am proposing to put the employees affected by the Hatch Act under the same ban, to put the same muzzle on them that applies to employees in civil service and which has applied to them for 50 years. It is a simple matter. The Senate has been discussing it for 2 weeks, and everyone understands it. We know exactly what we would be doing to these employees. We would be extending to them the same provisions which have governed the civil service for 50 years, and if we have been doing it that long, merely increasing the number should not make any difference.

Mr. CONNALLY. If we put these employees under civil service, would we not remove practically all temptation to engage in politics?

Mr. MINTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. When most of them engage in politics they do so in order to get a job or to hold a job. If we make them secure in their jobs, they will not be very active in politics. Many of them do not desire to be, anyway. If one of them can get a job and hold it, he will forget all about the man who helps him get the job.

Mr. MINTON. If we are going to dehorn them, we should take them away from the longhorns. We should put them in the same category with the employees who have these safeguards, because we are putting them under the same ban which applies to the civil-service employees.

Simple as this proposal is, I cannot see how anyone can resist it. It cannot be said that it would emasculate the bill; it cannot be said it is an attempt to defeat the bill, or destroy it. This certainly must be in consonance with what the Senator from New Mexico is trying to do. He is trying to protect people from the vicious thing known as politics. He wants to get the employees out of politics. He certainly wishes to treat them fairly after he gets them out. If he is to put a civil-service muzzle on them, he should put a civil-service leash on them. They should have the same protection in all respects as the other employees enjoy.

There is no reason why this matter should go to the Committee on Civil Service. It is merely a question of whether 271,000 more should come under the protection and safeguards of the civil service when a civil-service muzzle is put on them. They are being prevented from taking any part in politics, and they should be safeguarded against the things which will happen to them in politics.

How long would these employees last in their jobs if someone came along who was unfriendly to them in politics? They cannot do anything to defend themselves; they are helpless. They go out if they do anything to try to protect themselves. So in all fairness we should give these employees the same safeguards we give the civil-service employees. It is a simple proposal, and it will not do, it seems to me, for the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Kentucky to say, "Well, I am going to consider this thing later on. I have been considering a bill which the Committee on Civil Service, or some other committee, has," when the matter is as simple as this amendment is.

The time is getting short, as the Senator from New Mexico said. It is getting very short for those opposed to the bill. We have to vote at 3 o'clock, and we want this amendment adopted now, in order that those affected by it may be protected, in order that they may have the shield about which the Senator from Kentucky talked a few days ago.

I want to shield these people. I do not want to see them knifed. I do not want to see them caught on the sword. It is evident that they are in the same class as civil-service employees, but they do not get the benefit of civil service. By this simple amendment we want to bring them in and give them the benefit of civil service.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the other day the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] made a speech on the subject of processes of democracy. He took occasion to point out that the pending bill, in its operations, following the appropriation of Federal money, would invade the rights of the States. This morning I noticed that the press contained the startling information that a district Federal court in Georgia had ordered the arrest of the Governor of Georgia. I am not familiar with the details of the fight in Georgia, but it seems that the Governor had some difficulty with the highway department, and in the exercise of his authority as Governor he called out the troops; he ejected the chairman of the highway commission, and locked up the office.

Mr. President, I thought that if there was a matter which was wholly within the jurisdiction of a sovereign State it was the State's internal improvements. It seems that the

Federal judge in question, in the exercise of the new power and the interpretation of States' rights extant today, enjoined the Governor from exercising his power to call out the troops and to declare martial law for a certain district. Along came the Federal judge and enjoined the Governor. The Governor paid no attention to the injunction, but did that which we have heretofore been taught to believe was his right. The Governor of a sovereign State was arrested by order of an inferior court because the Governor, in his sovereign capacity, exercised the function of Governor of a sovereign State. The Governor was addressing a great body of teachers, and the United States marshal went up on the platform and arrested him. He is now under the jurisdiction of the marshal to make his appearance before the court next Friday.

Mr. President, I do not hold any brief for the Governor of Georgia. I do not care a snap of the finger about the person in question, but I care about the principle involved. What has happened in this instance is indicative of the principle that is rampant today. It is also indicative of just where the present measure is leading us, as the Senator from North Carolina well said in his able address.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation strikes at the very foundation of democratic processes. We now see a Federal judge enjoining a State Governor. It does not place very much of a strain on one's imagination to imagine that the whole cabinet of that Governor and all the officers charged with administrative and ministerial duties were particeps criminis, and that all of them were enjoined by the Federal court. Where, then, would be the government of the State? Its representatives would be under arrest, incarcerated. It was proposed to take the Governor and put him in jail, but he squabbled around and got a stay of proceedings upon his humble promise to appear before the judge of the inferior Federal court to show why he should not be punished for disregarding the order of a court which we, the Congress, established. The Constitution provides for only one Court and limits its jurisdiction. I took pains this morning to read just how far the Supreme Court could go. Its duties involve no function of interfering with the processes of a sovereign State. That, Mr. President, is something which is pertinent to the very bill under consideration. The judge in question issued his injunction because the Governor was interfering with the expenditure of certain Federal money. So the State of Georgia must sink to the level of a county. The State is now wholly under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I want to warn all those who are rushing in with legislation of the type now under consideration that they are giving hostages to fortune.

I have inquired of the legal minds in this town, and none of them can recall a case of a judge enjoining a Governor and having him arrested. That came very near being done in the old days before the War between the States, and the reply came in what occurred from 1860 to 1865. We got licked, but we let them know that we were fighting. Oh, yes; we did. We astonished the world with the intrepid bravery and patriotism of the devoted followers of the immortal Lee and Jackson. No American needs to be ashamed of those two names.

Mr. President, clothed as the Court is with limited authority, an injunction cannot issue except in cases of equity. The case in question was wholly one to be decided by Georgia.

I am not sorry for Governor Rivers. I think he deserves everything that is being done to him. I wish he could be divorced from his high relations to the State of Georgia, and then let them put him in jail. I think he deserves to go there. I am speaking solemnly. He backed up packing the Supreme Court and asked the proponents to that plan to pour their shekels into Georgia, and they converted shekels into shackles. Now he is threatening to call out the militia. He ought to do it. He is sovereign in the State of Georgia. But I want my colleague to understand what this thing in Georgia foreshadows.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that the Governor of Georgia could probably get a very quick test of the matter by applying to the Supreme Court of the United States directly for a writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. SMITH. I know it, but I do not know whether the Governor would like to do that or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. He would rather do that than go to jail.

Mr. SMITH. Within the sovereign rights he has as Governor and the limitation of the power of the Federal courts over the States he would not go to jail. If I were the Governor I would fight it out in Georgia. I would not go to the Supreme Court. As it is now constituted he must be worse off if he went there than he is now. I think I would advise him to stay away from the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I do not want my colleagues to lose the implication in the Georgia incident. What has taken place there is exactly in line with the implications of the pending bill; that the Federal Government has plenary power wherever its money goes, and Congress is turning over to the Civil Service Commission the power to determine what is or what is not a violation of the law. It is provided in the bill, it is true, that some poor devil who may violate its provisions shall have access to the Court. But how many such violators of this law would be able to take advantage of that particular provision? How many of them would be able to get access to the Court?

Mr. President, an inferior court has arrested the supreme executive of the only supreme, unregulated, and unspecified power in America, namely, a State. Georgia helped create the Federal Government. Now the Federal Government has become so large that it is destroying its creator. It is an embarrassing position for the Governor. I hope this body will appreciate the significance of that incident. It is the natural logic of events growing out of our departure from the Constitution of the United States.

Heretofore on the floor of the Senate I have enumerated certain things which every lawyer and every other person who loves the dual form of government knows are violations of the Constitution. Mark my words—a false principle wrought into real life will work itself out in disaster. The most horrible thing in public life is an unfortunate precedent. We are scattering them broadcast all over America. Of course, when we appropriate money we want to be the beneficiaries, politically and otherwise, of the appropriation. In the main that is what we appropriate money for. There are certain things that ought to be done.

Mr. President, some one very pertinently sends me a note saying, "Sherman is marching through Georgia again."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who? SHERMAN MINTON?

Mr. SMITH. The note says, "Sherman is marching through Georgia again."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator mean SHERMAN MINTON?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the note says, "Sherman." The Senator can apply it as he pleases. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not give a continental about the civil service. My observation has been that it has been the most uncivil thing ever incorporated into our political life. It puts certain men in office and keeps them in regardless of their fitness. Everyone knows that. It is an ingenuity by which the ins remain in, and the outs want to have some modification made of it until they get in.

There are many strange things connected with this bill, whose purpose is supposed to be to purify politics. I want to ask, When in the name of the God who made us do Senators expect to see pure politics? Senators know there is no "pure

politics." They do not expect any pure politics. Pure politics are not in operation here now.

Every man who has sense enough to become a Member of this body wants his little playhouse for his own benefit. He says, "I do not care a continental what the Constitution says, or what anything else says, but do not knock down my playhouse. I am going to stay where I will get the benefit of my breach of the rights of the people. You cannot pour out billions of dollars and not make me the beneficiary of it."

What saddens me is to see the great principles involved in our Government ignored when they affect our personal interest. God knows I have tried to adhere to those principles without regard to my political fortunes. I hate to inject myself into the debate, but I have never regarded my sitting in this body as essential to the welfare of America. Once I have assumed this responsibility, I believe that my duty is plain, and I shall live up to the fundamental principles of the Constitution so long as I am a Member of this body, regardless of who is in power.

This is a monstrous thing we are doing. We are saying to a man, "If you get a job, you must shut your mouth. You must not engage in politics." Along comes a Federal judge and enjoins the Governor of Georgia. The Governor disregards the injunction and is arrested. He is now under the jurisdiction of the United States marshal. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] suggests that the Governor go to the Supreme Court.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely suggested that he could go to the Supreme Court. I did not suggest that he do so. That is up to him. I do not mean to suggest.

Mr. SMITH. We have discarded the Constitution. I hope—and it is only a hope—that so long as men love freedom and their own self-respect, so long as men feel in their hearts that they have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and to enjoy the proceeds of their own efforts, so long will the Constitution and the immortal Bill of Rights be a glorious fact in their lives. There is not a liberty-loving man, one who loves genuine essential liberty, who would not fight and die for the Constitution of the United States, just as our forbears did.

I wish to take occasion again to refer to the injunction and arrest of the Governor of the sovereign State of Georgia because he interfered with the expenditure of certain Federal moneys in the State of Georgia. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] called attention to that situation. I hope and trust that some day there will be enough real Americans to get back that for which our forbears bled and died. There are many articles in the Constitution. The first seven deal largely with the relation of sovereign States to the Federal Government. The first 10 amendments define the inalienable rights of the individual.

As I have said, and now repeat, at one time we had patriots. We have them now. However, the modern crowd are p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s. We have more of those today than we have of p-a-t-r-i-o-t-s.

I hope that the Governor of Georgia will do his duty as a man and restore the sovereign power of the State, which was never given to the Federal Government. Were I the Governor of the State of Georgia there would be another local secession.

I think shortly we shall have amendments to the Constitution denying to the States their reserved powers. Today we have a government of men and not of law. That is what is the matter with us. We are bowing down and worshipping certain men because they have exhausted the Treasury and scattered their largess broadcast over the land.

Friday I sat in this Chamber and heard a Senator for whom I have the profoundest respect—or did have—say that this administration had done the necessary thing in ruthlessly scattering abroad billions of the hard-earned money of the people, and that he did not criticize the President of the United States for going into his State and denouncing him. His statement is in the Record. When I reach that level I

will quit this body. Whenever I shall honor a man belonging to my party who comes into my State and denounces me and say that I do not criticize him I will quit this body.

Senators do not seem to care to listen to my criticism or to what is going on, but so far as I am concerned I resent the tendency of this body to bow down and worship at the corrupt throne of money. That is what we are doing. We are selling everything dear to us to have a bridge built, or to have a courthouse built, or to have the W. P. A. or the P. W. A. come into the State and spend money. God grant that somewhere, somehow, the inherent love of liberty and individuality that characterized our forbears may be restored, and that the divine fire may touch the American people so that they will repudiate, in ignominy and shame, those who have prostituted the Government under which we live.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, just a word on the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON]. In substance, as the Senator explained, this amendment, if adopted and enacted into law, would automatically blanket into the civil service all the employees of the Federal Government not now under the civil service. It would do so without any examination as to qualifications or fitness for office, and would give full lifetime service and privileges to those employees.

I think the Senator from Indiana is moving in the right direction. I think he is going in the direction I want to go. One of the arguments I have made in behalf of legislation such as we have sponsored is that eventually, once we can remove employees from political activity, we shall be enabled to work out a really comprehensive merit system for all Federal employees. I want to do that. I think it should have been done a long time ago, but I do not believe that blanketing all Federal employees into the civil service with one stroke of the pen is working out an efficient merit system. In fact, I think the adoption of this amendment would be detrimental to the civil service itself, and would bring it into discredit and confusion.

The Ramspeck bill, which has passed the House of Representatives, is now before the committee presided over by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW]. If I am not mistaken, hearings have already been set. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. BULOW. They have not been set.

Mr. HATCH. But it is planned to have hearings on that bill in the near future, is it not?

Mr. BULOW. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I should very much like to have the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] submit his amendment to that committee and let the committee consider it before we take such a step.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator has pointed out that certain employees would go into the civil service without examination. That is what happens when the President covers them in under an Executive order, is it not?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. MINTON. All the amendment would do would be to cover them in under an act of Congress rather than an Executive order. That is the only distinction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not always true that they are covered in without an examination. Some Executive orders which have been issued required the incumbent to take an examination to determine his fitness for the position which he held; but it is true that many Executive orders have covered employees into the civil service without examination.

Mr. MINTON. That is the general rule.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is not my intention to take the time of the Senate to argue the various amendments which may be proposed. However, I think it would be a mistake to adopt this particular amendment—a mistake so far as the civil service is concerned, and a serious mistake so far as

the pending legislation is concerned. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to address myself to the pending amendment. I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent remarks of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and with unusual interest to his remarks on the subject of the arrest of the Governor of Georgia at the instance of the judge of the Federal court in that State under proceedings in contempt. The matter is a very unusual one, and it presents rather grave difficulties.

I do not know enough of the facts to undertake to discuss the matter. I may undertake to do so when I do know the facts; but it is my impression—this is from the newspapers—that the Governor of Georgia undertook to dismiss, and actually did dismiss, from the Highway Commission of the State of Georgia a ministerial officer—not an elective officer but an appointive officer—the chairman of the highway commission; whereupon the officer undertaken to be dismissed resisted, but was put out by the State troops at the instance of the Governor of Georgia. Now the situation is reversed; the Federal jurisdiction and power are invoked, and the Federal Government undertakes not to put the Governor of Georgia out of office but to put him into jail.

A man under arrest and in the jail or penitentiary for imprisonment is under disability. One cannot function in jail as a lawyer or as a contractor. He is under disability. I take it that when the Governor of Georgia is placed in jail for contempt by the Federal judge, certainly to a very considerable extent the Governorship of Georgia will be vacated. I take it further that if the Governor of Georgia should resist the United States marshal it would be the duty of the Federal judge to protect the dignity of his court and, if necessary, to call out Federal troops. The State troops having been called out in the first instance, and the Federal troops having been called out in the second instance, we might have another Battle of Manassas.

All of that is very serious. It is so far from our minds that it seems facetious, but fundamentally it is very serious. There is a grave conflict down there. I am not going to undertake to pass on the merits of it, but I am going to undertake to settle it. I think the Congress should act and act at once. I think it should act constructively. We have here this bill; and if we will apply the principles of this bill to that situation, it will all be solved in 24 hours.

This bill declares that if a State officer does certain things he shall be dismissed; he shall be removed. It declares that if the State Highway Commissioner of North Carolina, the head of that entire activity, shall engage in politics, he shall be removed. Why not say that the Governor of Georgia shall be removed if, having accepted gifts or loans from the Federal Government, he does not do just as the Federal judge down there says, or as Mr. Hopkins says, or as Mr. Ickes says? That is in precise analogy with this bill. Then suppose he says, "Well, now, that is the law, but I am not going to get out"—then apply the principle of this bill and say, "We will withdraw all the aid, all the loans, and all the grants of the Federal Government to your State of Georgia. Now you had better get out, and you will get out." I think Governor Rivers would be sure to get out, because he has been very active in the matter of obtaining—I say this to his credit, of course—loans, gifts, grants, and other aid from the Federal Government.

The whole incident perfectly illustrates what we are doing. We are setting up here the principle of Federal control of State officers by means of the Federal power through loans and grants. We are setting up the right to remove a State officer. Why not remove a Governor if we can remove a highway commissioner? Why not remove a Governor if we can remove a clerk? How does the Federal Government acquire jurisdiction over any local officer in North Carolina by merely lending us money which it collected from us or giving us money which it took from us?

I propose my solution; and if the time were not so brief, I would draw an amendment aimed directly at the Georgia situation. I think I could solve it upon the passage of this

bill. I think it is a solution which is much better than this warlike affair we have down there. It is not the use of the force of arms but the use of the force of money. The force of arms may be more honorable, but it is also more bloody and more disagreeable.

That is a serious situation. That is what this bill presents to us. I have never been concerned about the professed objective. I have never thought the bill would accomplish it, because I have been concerned about the interference with the process and the structure of our Government, our democracy.

My faith in my State is unshaken, and that is why I stand where I stand. If any Senator's faith in the capacity of his State to control the activities of its officers and clerks and sheriffs, and so on, has been lost, of course, he may vote for this legislation. He ought to get aid from the Federal Government; but nothing has happened to destroy my faith in North Carolina.

We have had many experiences, Mr. President. I am going to relate one which went far to restore my faith when it was shaken. I do not like to refer to disagreeable subjects. It is not good to linger by the bitter waters; but rarely in my life have I been more stirred than I was by the so-called purge in our party, when the Federal power was broadly invoked in order that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] might be driven out of the Senate. I was tremendously aroused and very gravely concerned, and I watched each contest with an overpowering interest. If I could tell the personal story, you would understand just how overpowering it was.

The culminating contest was the contest in the State of Georgia. I think my interest was tending to grow, anyway, with each contest; and it was beyond bounds, as the hour approached, when the right to a seat in the Senate of one of the noblest men I have ever known, one of the worthiest Senators in all the history of the Senate, one of the truest and most faithful Democrats who ever breathed the breath of our free land, was called in question by the President of the United States. I do not think I thought of anything else as I heard of the approach of the President to Georgia on that mission.

I have never spoken disrespectfully of the President of the United States or of any President, and I never intend to do so. When I heard of his approach to Barnesville all my thoughts were there, and I listened to his address when he called upon the Democrats of Georgia to strike down my friend, my fellow Democrat, a man whom I have always honored and always will honor, a man whose views and speeches differing from me could not possibly affect my high regard for him, my abiding confidence in him. I knew, as I heard that message, that the senior Senator from Georgia was on the platform. I was deeply stirred. I wondered what I would have said in the circumstances. I hoped and I prayed that the senior Senator from Georgia would find the right words; and he found them:

Mr. President, I regret that you have taken this occasion to attack my record and call in question my democracy. I wish you to know that I accept the challenge.

Historic words—immortal words! I am glad I can put them in the RECORD here. He summed up the whole substance of the relation of the State to the Federal power:

I accept the challenge.

It was not a personal challenge, and it was not a personal acceptance. It was an acceptance by the senior Senator from Georgia of the challenge of the Federal power to the dignity and the rights and the power of the State of Georgia. Georgia answered.

When the returns came in that September night—and I did not know what they were, because the radio accounts were not complete—I wondered whether Georgia would respond. I had a dread that she might not respond. I had a

sense of horror. I thought of nothing else. Sleep meant nothing. I wished to know. It was on the following night that I was informed of the fact that Georgia had given assurance to the United States that Georgia was equal to the challenge; that Georgia could attend to her own affairs; that she would choose whom she wished to choose for Senator; and I thanked God for Georgia. My faith in Georgia is not gone. My faith in the American people is not gone. I do not know enough about some of the American States, to be sure, but I am not going to lose my faith in the States. I never have lost that faith in North Carolina.

As I thought of it, I was reminded of an incident in the history of the English in which a certain matter was settled. There had been a time when the King appointed the ministers. There had been a time in the Roman history when the king or the dictator appointed the senators. Slowly, through the ages, the spirit of liberty, working in the form of democracy, had asserted the right of the people to represent themselves by men of their own choosing.

A contest began in England under George III, and the people lost. George insisted upon his right to appoint the ministers and denied the right of the Commons—the House of Representatives of England—to appoint the ministers. Under George IV the issue was made again. The Commons appointed a minister, and the King refused to recognize him. The Commons said, "You must recognize him," and he, considering the fate of Charles I, recognized him. From that day to this, even the ministers in England, the Cabinet officers, have derived their authority by no means from the King, but from the representatives of the people.

Coincident with that, the House of Commons took pains to give King George IV a further notice; that is to say, "From this day forward, so long as you or any of your successors sit upon the throne of England, you shall not interfere in the slightest degree with the election of a member of the House of Commons."

And from that day to this, the kingly head of the British Government has never so much as dared intimate that the humblest little borough in all England should listen to him in such a matter.

Mr. President, that was the fountain of local self-government and the right of representation breaking forth on the other side of the sea in the early days of our Republic, and it was not without its influence here. With that we thought we had set our standards, but today we have to assert and protest, in vain, I think, as the hour of 3 approaches, that the State of North Carolina, or the State of Georgia, or the State of South Carolina, is competent to say what shall be done and what shall not be done by the State and county and city officials, whether political or nonpolitical, whether moral or immoral, or whether of high degree or low degree. That is the issue here.

I think it was necessary for us to embark upon some of these Federal gift and loan activities, but if this is to be the consequence of it, whatever relief it has brought about, whatever apparent good it has done, will be as nothing compared with the destruction of local self-government, and of the dual form of the American structure, and our progress of democracy.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator very correctly recited the history of England, but there was one thing which I think the Senator might have stated as having occurred following the mandate of the Commons; that is, that the King did take notice, and did follow the mandate.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator. I thought I had stated that from that day to this no King of England, and no Queen, has ever so much as given the suggestion of a nod to the contrary. Those who have read the story of Queen Victoria, who followed George IV, will remember how that young Queen did not like her Ministers. She liked Malborne, but she did not like Disraeli. However, she had to like Disraeli. Then she came to like Disraeli. She did not like Gladstone. She made one of the most scorching remarks about Mr. Gladstone,

a beautiful sort of thing. She said, "Why, Mr. Gladstone addresses me as if I were a public assembly." She did not like him; but she had to like him. She did not like the liberal government, but she had to like the liberal government.

The kingly power was very great, but the power of the people in their right of representation was greater. The divine right of kings is a very great and historical doctrine, but the divine right of the American people to choose representatives of their own selection to govern their ways, in politics and otherwise, is greater than the divine right of kings, and more important to the progress of the world.

The pending bill may to some seem trivial, and there are those who are laboring under the delusion that it relates only to Federal officeholders, and there are others who have been led to believe that it is going to bring about the millennium of "clean politics." Even the newspapers put "clean politics" in half quotes, meaning "so-called," which is the idea of the half quote. While all those things are going on, we are comforted somewhat with the assurance that the bill may yet be defeated in the other body, although I know nothing about it, and I do not intend to say anything about what the House has ever done or may do. This bill is not by any means the end of the matter. If it shall pass, we will have established a policy which the instincts of the American people will in due season repudiate. If we do not pass it, there will be those who will continue to come here with this sort of proposal, and I should not be surprised if before I leave the Senate I do not see an effort to have the States controlled in their schools, their laws against crime, and in all other ways, by the demand that their officers be removed, and if they are not removed, Federal loans and grants will be taken from the States.

Since we have to pay our share of the taxes, that becomes a very drastic threat of fines and penalties. I am looking across the aisle now to a very able lawyer, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and I refer to the old system of fines and recoveries under the common law. They can fine my State \$3,000,000 in the matter of the highway funds alone; and, what is more, may recover.

I read in the Charlotte Observer this morning about some projects allowed in my State. This is Monday morning, and I suppose these were allowed on Saturday. I will refer to a few of them:

C. C. McGinnis, State W. P. A. administrator, has announced approval of 19 projects, to cost \$638,380.

That may all be very good, but I call attention to how it will operate.

Granville County: To improve Creedmore streets, \$19,846.

That means the end of all activities down there by every officer except the mayor. He may call his soul his own, but no one else can.

Wilkes: Extend water and sewer systems at Wilkesboro, \$5,924.

There will be no more political activity by anyone in Wilkesboro who is administering these funds. And these funds are going to municipalities.

Pitt County: Improve street at Fountain, \$5,982.

For \$5,982 Fountain and all her officers connected with the Government go out of politics.

Edgecombe: Build home-economics cottage for Tarboro High School, \$23,708.

That is a county activity, and I take it that everyone in the county, and in the city of Tarboro—a very ancient city—everyone who has to do with the municipal government will go out of politics. "Home-economics cottage." That takes in the county officers and clerks.

Harnett: Erect building at Ridgeway School near Lillington, \$11,125.

I am not sure but that that takes out of politics the entire school organization of 23,000 teachers of North Carolina, because our school system is a State unit.

Alexander: Erect vocational building at Stony Point High School, \$3,381.

That is Alexander County.

Northampton: Improve streets, \$10,069.

It does not say where the streets are to be improved, but I dare say they will improve streets all around in Northampton. That is a great rural county, from which Gen. Matt Ransom came to the United States Senate. For \$10,069 they get the Northampton officers out.

Lenoir: Improve LaGrange streets, \$19,600.

That takes care of LaGrange.

Now they come to my county of Wake:

Wake, install sewer and water lines, \$22,461.

I take it that ends activities there by the county officers of Wake County; and that is a very big county. It has in it about 110,000 people.

Then we come to the next:

Improve North Carolina State College grounds, \$55,080.

I dare say that takes in the entire State government, because the State College is a State institution, supported by the State. That gets them all.

Then we come to Apex, Mallaby Cross Roads, Fuquay Springs, and Garner, \$81,804. All those are towns in my county.

That is what we are doing. How are we doing it? We are saying, "You do as the Federal Government says in this matter of political activity. We will be the judges, not you. If we catch anybody down there not doing as we say, we will report him, and if you do not turn him off the job, we will take the money away from you."

Mr. President, that tends to destroy the dual form of government in the United States. That is running the whole thing on the basis of Federal loans and grants which were intended to relieve the people of America, and not to control the States and the counties and the cities.

My friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] asks me not to forget to tell whose money it is. I told that the other day, but I will tell it again today. The money is taken from the States by the power of taxation, or is borrowed by the Federal Government on the credit which is derived from the power of the Government to tax the people in the States. We are using the taxing power of the Federal Government to hand out loans or grants throughout the United States, using it not for the purpose of doing the good intended by the appropriations but for the purpose of controlling activities which heretofore have always been in the control of the States, and which to this day I have always thought the States were fully capable of attending to, to their own satisfaction, and much better in the long run than the Federal Government can ever do it.

So, Mr. President, while viewed superficially, this is a simple matter, and it might be considered a trivial matter; viewed by way of its implications, it is a very great matter. That is all I have to say about it.

I am not troubled that the vote is going against us today. I would be very greatly troubled if I were not making my record of opposition here today, and that is all I have to do. I hope I may live long enough to see those who make a different record, in the very best of motives, to be sure, learn by bitter experience to repent establishing a precedent which cannot but redound to the destruction of the States, the localities, and of representative government.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulow	Danaher	Guffey
Ashurst	Byrd	Davis	Gurney
Austin	Byrnes	Donahay	Hale
Bailey	Capper	Downey	Harrison
Bankhead	Caraway	Ellender	Hatch
Barbour	Chandler	Frazier	Hayden
Barkley	Chavez	George	Herring
Bilbo	Clark, Idaho	Gerry	Hill
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	Gibson	Holman
Brown	Connally	Gillette	Holt

Johnson, Calif.	Minton	Russell	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Schwartz	Townsend
La Follette	Neely	Schwellenbach	Tydings
Lee	Norris	Sheppard	Vandenberg
Lodge	Nye	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Smathers	Wagner
Lundeen	Overton	Smith	Walsh
McCarran	Pepper	Stewart	Wheeler
McKellar	Pittman	Taft	White
McNary	Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	
Maloney	Reed	Thomas, Okla.	
Mead	Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea," and, if present, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained in Government departments.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bailey	Donahay	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Guffey	McKellar	Smathers
Brown	Hayden	Minton	Stewart
Byrnes	Herring	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
Connally	La Follette	Pittman	Wheeler

NAYS—57

Adams	Downey	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	McCarran	Shipstead
Barbour	Frazier	McNary	Taft
Barkley	George	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Gerry	Mead	Tobey
Bridges	Gibson	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Gillette	Norris	Tydings
Byrd	Gurney	Nye	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hatch	Overton	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Radcliffe	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Davis	Lee	Schwartz	

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews	Glass	King	Smith
Ashurst	Green	Lucas	Truman
Bone	Harrison	Miller	Wiley
Burke	Hughes	Slattery	

So Mr. MINTON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment presented by me on March 6 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in certain areas of the country, and especially adjacent to Washington, a majority of the residents of certain towns and counties are employees of the Federal Government. My amendment is for the purpose of giving the Civil Service Commission the authority to permit a Federal employee to take part in purely local elections when it is considered in the interest of the public welfare to do so.

If that is not done, Mr. President, those Federal employees will be denied the right even to hold a nonprofit office, such as member of the school board or member of the town council; and, in my judgment, serious injury to the cause of good government will be done unless those Federal employees are permitted, under regulations adopted by the Civil Service Commission, to take part in purely local affairs.

I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and it is my understanding that he has no objection to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without naming the particular locations to which the Senator's amendment would apply, am I to assume that the "special or unusual circumstances" which exist in any municipality would be intended to cover the situations in Maryland and Virginia, for instance, where many Federal employees who work in Washington live, who otherwise might not participate in any way in their local affairs? Is that the intention?

Mr. BYRD. It is. The amendment gives to the Civil Service Commission the same power it now has with respect to civil-service employees, to permit them to participate in local elections.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia if it would not be possible for him so to draft his amendment as to name specifically in the amendment the facts which the Civil Service Commission must find? As the amendment is drafted, it seems to me, it gives the Civil Service Commission almost carte blanche authority to determine for itself what the "special or unusual circumstances" are which should operate to exempt persons from the rule. I understand that the Senator is endeavoring to reach a perfectly obvious situation which arises when civil-service employees of the Federal Government who are working in the Capital at Washington reside in communities in Virginia and Maryland, in which, perhaps, the bulk of the population is likewise so employed; so that not to exempt them might have a very detrimental effect upon the community. The amendment is so drawn that it is not limited by geography, by boundaries of States, or by character of employment. It seems to me that in its present form it would set up a precedent for transferring to the Civil Service Commission complete power to grant exemptions.

Mr. BYRD. Only with respect to local elections.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but no rule is set forth in the amendment to control the delegation to the Civil Service Commission of legislative power. No standard is set up.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I would like the amendment to be more specific. I conferred with the Senator from New Mexico. This was the only amendment which I presented to the Senator from New Mexico to which he would agree; and I was so anxious to permit my constituents in Virginia to take part in purely local affairs that I acquiesced in the language of the amendment as it is now written.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Virginia correctly states the situation. However, I was not opposed to any particular amendment. The matter related to a subject with which I was not familiar. A great many persons from nearby towns came to see me and discussed the situation, and I suggested that they confer with the Senators from Maryland and Virginia, all of whom probably have conferred with various persons on the subject. I think at one time the Senator from Virginia prepared an amendment which actually set forth the towns to be listed in the order of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. HATCH. Someone did. I saw such an amendment. The Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] called attention to a similar condition in one of the towns in his State, which such an amendment would have met. Inasmuch as the amendment which the Senator now offers merely restores to the Civil Service Commission the power it had, and which it exercised before the passage of the act last year, I thought perhaps it was wise to give general authority to meet local or domestic situations. I have no particular opinion on the matter, one way or the other. Any way the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Wyoming wish to work out the situation is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is meant by the phrase "or other political subdivision"? The amendment mentions "any municipality," which is clearly understood. What is meant by the following phrase, "or other political subdivision"? Would it be a county or congressional district?

Mr. BYRD. No. It would be a subdivision of the municipality. It would be a township, or a magisterial district, such as we have in our State.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to limit the amendment to subdivisions of municipalities the Senator ought to have the word "thereof" after "subdivision," so as to read, "any municipality or political subdivision thereof."

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will read further, the language is—

It is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable—

It means in the interest of the people of the particular locality.

Mr. BARKLEY. The trouble is that the language "political subdivision" is not necessarily limited to a municipality. It might be the entire county, because that is a subdivision.

Mr. BYRD. It is intended to apply to the entire county.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would it apply to a judicial district, in which a candidate might be running for the office of district judge or district attorney? Would it apply to a congressional district, which is a political subdivision so far as elections are concerned? All I am trying to do is to clarify the language, so that we may see what we really shall be doing if the amendment shall be agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to make an inquiry. Are the persons in the municipalities to which the Senator refers interested in an election in which the Democratic or the Republican Party is involved; or are the parties purely local?

Mr. BYRD. They are the regular parties.

Mr. BROWN. They are the regular Democratic and Republican Parties?

Mr. BYRD. So far as Virginia is concerned, they are the regular Democratic and Republican Parties.

Mr. BROWN. I myself had an amendment, to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] have substantially agreed, which covered somewhat the same general situation. My amendment provided that nothing in the act shall be construed to prevent any lawful political activity in an election and a preceding campaign, at which there are no candidates on party tickets representing a party which polled votes for President in the previous election. Would such an amendment help the Senator?

Mr. BYRD. It would not help this particular situation.

Mr. BROWN. I thought it might.

Mr. BYRD. In this particular case perhaps the best citizens of the counties are employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have understood that in one county almost the entire population is employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. BYRD. In Arlington County 80 percent of the citizens are employees of the Federal Government. The other night I talked with a gentleman from Arlington County. He would have to resign his position on the school board, a position he has filled for many years with great satisfaction to the people of the community, and for which he has not received a dollar of compensation.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator object to inserting, in line 4, after the word "subdivision", the phrase "in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital, in the States of Virginia and Maryland." Such language would refer specifically to the case which he desires to cover.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have no objection to that modification, but I do not wish to accept any amendment to the amendment which would endanger its passage because the matter is of very vital importance to my constituents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I entirely sympathize with the objective which the Senator from Virginia is trying to attain, but it is clear that the language of the amendment is so broad that it might throw down the bars to almost any kind of exemption, should the Civil Service Commission decide to make it, because there is nothing in the language of the amendment to determine what sort of "special or unusual circumstances" the Civil Service Commission would have to find.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that if that amendment is satisfactory to the Senator from New Mexico, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to the language proposed by the Senator from Wyoming. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia applies chiefly to the situation around the District of Columbia. There may be other cases, such as the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] says he had, in which the employees were practically all Federal employees because of construction work going on in the State, and they could not have any city government.

I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that the power is exactly the same power which the Civil Service Commission has been exercising. The language of this amendment is taken from the order made by the Civil Service Commission in 1912, when they exempted towns in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will accept the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia modify his amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Wyoming, as I understood, offered an amendment to my amendment. I should like to say that I have no objection to that amendment. I shall be glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia modifies his amendment in accordance with the suggestion made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to this amendment, although I do not intend to talk on the subject of the amendment. I wish to speak in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield the floor?

Mr. BYRD. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire at this time, very briefly, to call attention to an editorial which appeared on Saturday, March 16, in the Washington Daily News, entitled "Barkley Comes Through." Since the editorial is very brief, I am going to take the liberty of reading it:

BARKLEY COMES THROUGH

Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, has taken some heavy ribbing from a few of his Democratic colleagues in the course of the long and often bitter debate on the new Hatch bill.

It has been repeatedly charged, and not without point, that had it not been for the conduct of Senator BARKLEY's campaign for reelection in 1938 there might never have been any such thing as either the Hatch Act of 1939, forbidding Federal employees to take active part in politics, or the pending Hatch bill, which applies the same rules to State employees paid with United States funds.

That may be true. Certainly the Barkley-Chandler campaign of 1938, in which the Federal pay-roll machine in Kentucky locked horns with the State pay-roll machine, was one contest which, above all others, dramatized the great need for putting strings on the public-tax purse. The people of this country are willing to pay taxes, and in emergencies even to borrow against future taxes, to provide relief for the needy, pensions for the aged, work for the jobless, and to carry on other essential services of government. But the people, thus burdened, have every right to demand—and have demanded—that their tax money be spent for the purposes for which it is appropriated, and those purposes only. Hence the growing public insistence on the Hatch safeguards against using public money to perpetuate political power.

But we stray. We are writing now about the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mr. BARKLEY. He has been no special hero of ours. We did not spare him in 1938. Nevertheless, there is no grudging in the tribute we pay him for his performance in 1940. If he is by 2 years a wiser man, that is more than can be said for some of his colleagues who have been ridiculing him through the 2 weeks in which he has patiently and successfully advanced the new Hatch bill to a final Senate vote.

In championing this reform which his own experience has shown to be the right thing to do, which the people have demonstrated they want, and which his own President has approved, Mr. BARKLEY has performed a notable service for the Democratic Party and the country.

The Senate will pass the bill Monday. And in no small way that final vote will be a monument to ALBEN BARKLEY's persistence and parliamentary skill.

Mr. President, I have not always agreed with the majority leader in this body, although I have, for many years, entertained for him a deep affection, and have always held him in the highest respect and esteem; but I desire to join, as many another American must join, in this tribute paid him by the Washington Daily News for the excellent tact, the urbanity, the vigilance, the industry, the courage, the brilliant parliamentary skill, and the fine eloquence which have brought this bill to its present final status.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this amendment, but I do desire to say in a few moments something about the pending bill.

When I originally started to attack politics and corruption in the distribution of Federal and State money it was not popular with many on this side of the aisle. We are making progress, however, and I am glad to say that in this bill we are taking another step forward. We are not taking liberty away from the voters, as some try to say, but it is a step toward protecting the voters in the States from the coercion

by money, not the money of any party but the money of all the taxpayers.

The greatest coercion we have in politics today is the coercion of officials using Federal and State money to suit their own purpose. Some say that if we pass this bill the Federal Government will have its control in every county in the United States. It has today. Let a local subdivision try to challenge one of the bureaucrats in Washington, and just see how long it will be until the project in that local subdivision is shut down. It is not the question of liberty that is involved in the passage of the pending bill.

There are two groups against the Hatch bill: First, the State spoilsmen; second, those who believe in States' rights. The first group are fighting a battle of self-preservation, and I do not say that they have not a right to do so. The second group are wrong in their contention. I think the mistake of those who are fighting for States' rights is in the fact that they tolerated and continued and promoted the action of the Federal Government in dumping money into the States.

Some individuals on the floor of the Senate opposing this bill as an invasion have been 98 percent for the Federal Government going into the States, but they do not want it to bother their 2 percent. They are 100 percent for taking the money, but they say the Federal Government has no right to regulate how the money is used.

It is really ridiculous to hear some who have wanted to regulate the least part of State and local and individual liberty now talking about this bill interfering with the liberty of individuals. Are they interested in the liberty of individuals? Or are they interested in distributing and using the Federal money to oil and control State politics?

I could tell about conditions in my State, and go into the subject at length. My colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] has done so. Copies of much of that evidence I have in my possession, and much more I could add; but I do not intend to take the time of the Senate by so doing, because many other Senators desire to speak in the limited time. I do say that it is high time for the Federal Government to stop the use of Federal money in attempting to control local, State, and Federal elections.

Some of the opposition to this bill is not because of a fear of the bill invading the liberty of individuals. It is because they want to take away the liberty of individuals to vote as they desire. They want the liberty to fire employees who dare to oppose the State machine.

I heard one Senator say, "You are going to stop individuals from going around at night and knocking on the doors and asking persons to help the party." They know the bill is not aimed to stop legitimate political activity. What the proponents of the bill desire to do, in my opinion, is to stop State officials who are paid in whole or in part from Federal funds going around during the day, when they are employed to work, and rounding up votes, and coercing employees to go along with the machine.

Let me read what a Senate committee has said about the use of the Federal authority and the State authority in the corruption of politics. I quote from the volume issued by the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures and Use of Governmental Funds, with reference to the State of Pennsylvania. That is what it says on page 186:

That W. P. A. workers and employees throughout the State of Pennsylvania have been threatened, intimidated, and coerced to change their voting registrations as the result of undue persuasion and pressure upon them, not only by officials and employees of the State highway department and other lesser political subdivisions of the State, and by political leaders therein, but by officials and supervisory employees of the Works Progress Administration as well.

Further it says, and I quote:

That in numerous instances high officials of the Works Progress Administration and employees of other agencies the expenses of which are, in part at least, paid with Federal funds, the officials and employees of the Pennsylvania State Highway Department, and the officials and employees of lesser political subdivisions of the State, stepped aside from their official duties and devoted their time

to an active furtherance of political matters and interests, without the formality of resigning or taking any proper leave of their official positions and duties.

Let me add that that is the type of liberty the Hatch bill is trying to take away on the part of individuals who are playing politics on Government time, while being paid by the Government taxpayers—the liberty to force workers to vote as the machine says or lose their jobs.

The committee says further:

That workers and employees of the Works Progress Administration, of other Federal agencies, of the State highway department, and of other lesser political subdivisions of the State were imposed upon, intimidated, and coerced in the matter of attending political meetings and functions by and through representations by political leaders.

That is the type of coercion this bill attempts to reach. It is not really a question of liberty; it is a question of going one step farther and trying to protect the ballot box. When the ballot box is controlled by political spoilsmen of the State, it is just as bad as having it controlled by political spoilsmen of the Federal Government. There is no difference at all. I am opposed to both types of control.

It is said that this bill does not go far enough; that it does not touch enough persons. Why not go as far as we can, and then gradually increase the scope of legislation until we give a death blow to political corruption?

As I said originally, I opposed political corruption of the W. P. A. I was for the original Hatch Act. I am for the pending Hatch bill, because I do not believe public money should be used for political purposes. That is what is happening. But the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] the other day said this bill could not be enforced because of the cost. Oh, no; the cost of government would not be increased by the passage of the pending bill. It would be lessened, because just as soon as those in charge of some of the rotten, corrupt State machines learn that they cannot use Federal money to control elections, they will not be so much interested in putting people on the State and Federal pay rolls and spending the money extravagantly.

The way to reduce the cost of government is to strike at the individuals who want to use the money of the Federal and State Governments for political purposes. We are now seeing a vast army of State and Federal officials doing nothing except playing politics on the public pay roll. This bill reaches out and stops some of them.

In my State, some individuals work for the State roads commission and are paid partly by the State government and partly by the W. P. A. If they are paid entirely by the W. P. A. they are now covered under Federal law. Under the present circumstances, those who are paid partly by the State and partly by the W. P. A. are exempt. The pending Hatch bill will cover both of them.

The argument of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Minton] and others is that because some are now exempt, all should be exempt. In other words, his argument is, since those committing a wrong are running loose in the country, we should open the doors and let all the wrongdoers loose.

Mr. President, that is not my idea of good government. I say another wrong will not correct the original wrong.

The time has come when we should keep the ballot box inviolate. When we are talking about war for democracy across the seas, remember that the heart of democracy here is the ballot box, and when that is corrupted through Federal funds, through coercion, or through any of the many things I could mention, there is a blow at the heart of democracy. The purpose of the Hatch Act is not to take away the liberty of individuals, but to protect their liberty.

Mr. President, I have been suffering from a severe sore throat, and I wish I could speak longer, but I cannot. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this place in the RECORD a statement of my own in furtherance of my position on the Hatch Act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the Hatch bill passes the Senate this afternoon, as I am confident it will, it will add another safeguard to the protection of elections in this country. On February 17, 1936, I spoke on the floor of the United States Senate against the use of the Federal W. P. A. funds for political purposes. Many times thereafter I arose to condemn the use of Federal funds for building political machines.

When there was an amendment submitted to the W. P. A. appropriation bill to prohibit political activity of W. P. A. officials I supported it with my voice and vote.

When the original Hatch bill was presented to the Senate, I publicly praised it as a step toward protecting the Federal workers from pressure of those controlling political machines and from officials who expected to "play politics."

Today we shall see the Senate take another step forward in the path of cleaning up politics.

Tomorrow some of the holes, of which the opponents speak, will be plugged by suitable legislation.

I believe the people in 1938 called for cleaning up the elections. I believe the people wanted no more of the scandal they had seen in the corruption of the ballot box through the use of Federal money as was the case in Pennsylvania and other States.

THE DAY OF THE SPOILSMAN IS GONE

The day of the pernicious spoilsman is gone. He may be in the saddle in some of the States of the Union, but I have confidence in the people that there will be a definite move to clean up those machines that have coerced the employees and degraded the democratic process of the ballot box.

For a long while the Government employees under civil service have been protected in their liberty of casting their votes as their consciences dictated. When that act was passed, no doubt the statement was made that the liberty of those individuals was being impaired.

Since I have been in the Senate I have seen moves to free the W. P. A. workers from the control of the politicians who would deprive them from sharing in relief if they failed to vote right. Next, the Hatch Act lifted the coercion and pressure from Federal officials. Now this bill lifts such pressure from the State officials paid in whole or in part by Federal funds.

WHOSE LIBERTY?

The argument of those opposing this legislation that it takes the liberty from the little fellow is all wrong. It gives him liberty, the liberty to do his work—work he was paid to do and not political work for which he was not employed. It gives him the liberty to vote as a free man.

The only individuals who will lose liberty under this bill are those who feel they have the liberty to force Government workers to get active in politics or lose their jobs. The liberty of those who want the Federal Government to pay for political machinery is curtailed. It should be. The liberty of coercing the little fellows is taken away from those who have and are misusing their official positions. The liberty to blackmail the employees out of part of their meager salaries is taken away. That is the liberty lost, not liberty for the good of the country but liberty of officials to take others' liberties from them.

Why should Federal-State workers be prohibited from pernicious political activities? I have never believed it is the duty of the taxpayers to pay for campaign workers. I feel that Government workers are employed to administer the activities of government as set out in the laws of this country, not to play politics. If the campaign worker is employed for political activity, his job should be eliminated and save the already overburdened taxpayer that much money.

The best type of political work any Government official can do is to do his or her job well. The great majority of the American people are more interested in those working on the Federal-State highways doing their work in building highways than building political fences.

JEFFERSON'S QUALIFICATIONS

The father of our party set forth three qualifications for public officials that we can afford to follow. They are fidelity, capacity, and honesty.

There has always been in my mind the feeling that the American people will reelect that party that serves the best interest of the country. I do not believe it is necessary that a party has to appropriate money out of the Treasury to finance a party machine unless that party has failed to do its duty. The surest way a party can stay in power is to appoint men who have Jefferson's qualifications, fidelity, capacity, and honesty. No party has to purchase its reelection unless it has failed in its duty and its promise. To those who say this bill is a blow at the Democratic Party, I say they are heaping abuse on the record of the party. It is not a blow to the party but its passage will be a great help. The Democratic Party came into power and has stayed in power through the independent votes, those individuals who vote for one party and another depending upon the issues involved. The great independent vote of America does not want corruption or coercion in elections. I do not subscribe to the theory that we must buy our way back. If we must, we do not deserve the support of the people.

Has the Democratic Party reached the stage that its existence depends upon the pernicious political activity of Government employees? I think not. These pernicious spoilsmen have hurt the party in their selfish desire to control their States. Many States went Republican in 1938 because of the resentment of

the people against Democratic spoilsmen in those States. The American people, when they find out the facts, are not going to tolerate corruption of the ballot box. Our party will make its greatest growth when it eliminates those spoilsmen within our ranks whose sole reason for interest in the party is to get something from it.

I have heard it said that these State machines who are using the Federal money for their perpetuation are not compelling workers to do things they would not do voluntarily. Nonsense. Anyone who knows politics knows that pressure has been used. By whom was the amount of 2 percent arrived at? By the little fellow? No. By the official up at the top in whose hands the little fellows' jobs were at stake. Of course, a worker does not have to donate 2 percent. He can quit his job. There isn't a Senator in this body but who knows that these assessments in many States are at the point of the political shotgun. Why is it the little fellow, for whom many words have been spoken, writes and says he cannot sign his name to a letter for fear of losing his job? Why is it the stenographer, many of whom are supporting their elderly parents, gives 2 percent of her salary? Because she knows it is to protect the other 98 percent, or at least protect it unless the machine gets in desperate need of money. The only compulsion used is if the donation is not made, the worker loses her job. She has the right to voluntarily contribute or quit.

May I say here, I do not think this bill is perfect. I, for one, want to see the time come when individuals employed in the Government hold their position as a matter of merit. This, of course, does not go that far, but some day that will happen and we will have a better Government as a result of it.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

I have heard it said that this bill is an extension of Federal bureaucracy. Those who make that claim would be in better position to raise that argument had their record shown they opposed the extension of the Federal Government when it was stepping through act after act into the State.

They have supported restriction after restriction on the individual citizen within the States. They have set up bureau after bureau on the State. But now we hear their voices being raised that the Federal Government must stop—not stop sending money to control elections through the State machines but stop trying to control that money from its wrongful use.

Some individuals raising that argument have voted for legislation that controls the farmer's right to plow his own land and plant thereon. They have voted for legislation that controls the smallest business in the smallest towns. They have voted for legislation to have the Government pry and snoop into the everyday activities of citizens.

No voice was raised then. Why? A large officeholding bureaucracy was set up to enforce these regulations and the individuals employed were named as part of political patronage. There was no voice raised by these individuals against that; but when the Senate attempts to pass a bill to regulate the pernicious political activity of the politically appointed regulators, then they yell and scream "Invasion of Federal bureaucracy."

Their viewpoint would have had sounder ground had they raised their objections when the Government set up these alphabetic agencies that have regulated the smallest detail of the life of many. They believed in political regulation by the regulators but no congressional prohibition against stopping the pernicious political activities of those job holders who owe their job to working on Government time for the continuation of the spoils system.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said: "If the argument made by the proponents of this legislation prevail, and we pass it, we had just as well get ready to see the greatest curtailment of Federal expenditures and the greatest curtailment and restriction of Federal extension that we have seen in a long time in this country."

How true! How wonderful!

We will see the desire to spend money greatly curtailed when State machines know they have to spend that money for the purpose for which it was appropriated and not for politics. Some of us have been wanting to see a restriction of Federal spending. The Senator from Florida, an opponent to this bill, has pointed a way. It will be a step to stop Federal bureaucracy, not a step to promote it.

STATES' RIGHTS

Some say this bill invades States' rights. Some of the finest men in the Senate believe that. Some of the most intellectual of our body say that, but I believe they are wrong. I believe this bill protects States' rights. It protects the State against Federal slush funds. Its purpose is to preserve freedom in elections. That is toward States' rights, not away from it. When the Federal group makes a political alliance with a State machine to control elections it is a blow against the rights of the people of that State. Such a combination forces the citizens into an unfair election with the cards stacked against them—the people from whom this Government must get its rights.

This bill says that the money we appropriate to build roads shall be used to build roads in the States, not to be used to control election machinery of that State by putting on employees whose divided duties are part-time work and part-time politics. It says: You who are paid by the Federal Government shall have the right to vote as you please. You shall have the right to select those you believe to be the best public servants, and that you

may select them without fear of losing your job, and if you do not do the bidding of the political boss. The one purpose, as I see it, of this legislation is to preserve the freedom of elections, and I hold that is no violation of the rights of any State.

FREE GOVERNMENT

We must protect the heart of democracy—elections. Without free elections we cannot have a free government. Without free government there are no rights. The Federal Government is spending millions and millions of dollars on projects for which the State government names the employees. We are determined that money shall be used for the purpose for which it is appropriated, not as a slush fund to coerce and compel the citizens of the States to accept the control of the State boss and his machine.

The Hatch Act is a protection to the liberties of the employees and not a restriction against their liberties.

The Hatch Act is a move to stop the State political machines from using Federal money to buy elections and coerce employees.

The Hatch Act is a move toward a more efficient Government service—giving the employees a chance to devote their time and their effort to the job they are employed to do and not force them to divide their time and their effort between their jobs and their political activity.

The Hatch Act is a move to protect the heart of democracy—the freedom of elections. It is a step toward better government. It is not a cure-all, but it is the proper medicine to help the patient improve from a terrible case of political spoils.

Ten years ago this January, in my first public office, that of a member of the West Virginia House of Delegates, I raised my voice against extending and promoting the spoils system. I opposed requiring the taxpayers to pay for political workers. If we have the spoils system, let us not make it worse by coercion. I believe in the statement of a great Democrat, "He who serves his people best serves his party best." I do not believe the Public Treasury is a party Treasury. It belongs to all of the people, and when it is used for political purposes it is in violation of a sacred trust. Corruption never built a party. We must demand fidelity, capacity, and honesty.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a few brief remarks on the pending measure.

I voted for the original Hatch Act, and I expect to vote for the pending Hatch amendment. During the 4-year period 1934–38 of the Democratic administration in Pennsylvania political macing and forced changes of registration were so common as to constitute a national disgrace. Pennsylvania has been charged with all sorts of political corruption, but never was it proven so convincingly as in the report of the Sheppard Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee following the election of 1938.

The most extreme abuses were found in connection with the administration of W. P. A. During these many years I have voted consistently for the W. P. A. appropriations, knowing that these funds when used for relief would be used by the then existing administration to build a political machine which would attempt to oppose me. I did not allow thought of my own political future to deter me from voting to meet human needs. However, I never lost an opportunity to protest the partisan administration of W. P. A.

The forced collections from W. P. A. personnel through the sale of picnic tickets and work-relief cards in Pennsylvania has been branded indelibly on the minds of our citizens. This was a decisive factor in the defeat of the Democratic ticket in our State in 1938. These abuses were so widespread, and the knowledge of them so common, that there came to be a general revulsion of public opinion against them. It was not necessary to attempt to produce extensive arguments to prove that these unsavory conditions existed. Charges of political corruption were made in the campaign of 1938, and the conditions were so terrible that no attempt was made to answer the charges. Indeed, Mr. President, they could not be answered. It was shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that the most extreme partisanship had prevailed among federally appointed officials operating the W. P. A. and other Government agencies in our State. The result of the election of that year should stand forever in the annals of our State as a lasting signpost warning against the waste of public-welfare funds for selfish partisan purposes.

In view of these conditions, which I am glad to say have since improved, and yet which will require eternal vigilance, I believe the enactment of the pending amendment is required. It should not be viewed as a partisan measure but as a genuine safeguard of public morality.

I shall vote for the pending bill.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I have an amendment to suggest to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming. I have been unable to find the Senator from Wyoming in the last few minutes—he has left the floor of the Senate—and I am wondering whether I might offer my amendment and, if it is acceptable to the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from New Mexico, have it accepted, with the understanding that if it meets with opposition on the part of the Senator from Wyoming, I will have no objection to its being reconsidered between now and 3 o'clock.

The amendment which I propose is to insert after the words inserted by the Senator from Wyoming, the following language:

In municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States.

In proposing this amendment I have in mind only one situation. In the State of Washington is the city of Bremerton, at which place is located the Puget Sound Navy Yard. The Puget Sound Navy Yard is the industry of the city of Bremerton. A majority of the citizens of Bremerton are either employed by or are members of the family of someone employed by the Government at the navy yard.

For many years there has been an understanding, no official understanding, but one that has been carried out, that the navy-yard employees should be entitled to a certain number of places on the school board. The school board is a non-political organization, membership on it does not carry any salary, and the work of the members is done in a way similar to that in which such work is done by citizens in other communities.

The citizens of Bremerton have been very much disturbed, since the enactment of the present Hatch law, for fear the employees of the navy yard would be deprived of their representation on the school board because of that law. I offer this amendment merely to meet that situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would that situation probably not also be found to exist at the town of Norris, in Tennessee, where a majority of the voters of the town are employed by the Tennessee Valley Authority? Would it apply to that locality?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should think it would.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in my opinion the proposal of the Senator from Washington is eminently fair, and I accept it as a modification of my original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia modifies his amendment again. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia as modified.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment restated now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Wyoming is now in the Chamber, and I should like to inquire of him whether or not the amendment which I have proposed is satisfactory to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my comments this morning were prompted solely by the feeling that the original language which was presented was too broad, and would con-

vey to the Civil Service Commission certain powers without any rule or standard to control the discretion of the Civil Service Commission in deciding when to grant an exemption. For example, the amendment provided that "Whenever the Civil Service Commission determines that by reason of special or unusual circumstances," and so forth, without any hint as to what the Commission should hold to be a special or unusual circumstance. After having addressed one or two questions to the Senator from Virginia I elicited the information that his purpose was to grant exemptions to employees in communities close to the Capital, in which it would be practically impossible to carry on local municipal government if an exemption were not granted, because so many of the voters are employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the little town of Norris, in east Tennessee, where the Norris Dam has been established, on the Clinch River, a majority of the inhabitants of the town are working for the Government, directly or indirectly. I dare say a majority of the voters are working for the Government, and they certainly should be exempted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct in that observation, and I take it that the language now offered by the Senator from Washington will cover the situation wherever it exists.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will, and I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will ask the clerk to report the second amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the further amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following new section:

SEC. —. No person, firm, or corporation entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, or performing any work or services for the United States or any department or agency thereof, or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, shall, during the period of negotiation for, or performance or furnishing of, such contract, work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly, make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; nor shall any person knowingly solicit any such contribution from any such person, firm, or corporation for any such purpose during any such period. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, 5 years ago the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] prepared a bill designed to prohibit contributions for political purposes from those who make money out of governmental contracts. He came to the Senator from Virginia and did me the great honor and courtesy of requesting that I become a patron with him of the legislation. The language just read by the clerk is identical with the bill that was prepared by the Senator from New Mexico 5 years ago and introduced jointly by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Virginia.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, notwithstanding diligent efforts on the part of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Virginia we were unable to secure a favorable report on the bill, and it therefore did not come to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I pay tribute to the fine sincerity with which he has, from almost the very first day when he came to the Congress of the United States, worked for pure and honest elections. I heartily and sincerely commend him, for his effort. I am not in accord with all the measures he

proposes in his attempt to accomplish laudable objects, but I am in accord with much of what he has proposed.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that the amendment I have just offered is not in any way an amendment hostile to his bill. It is in complete harmony with the proposed legislation that we should prohibit those who have governmental contracts, contractors who deal with the Government, contractors who make great sums out of governmental contracts, from making contributions to political parties for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. President, we propose under this legislation to prevent Tom Jones, who works on the road for \$3 a day, from taking any part whatsoever in political campaigns, even to the extent of providing as I read the terms of the bill, that he cannot in the privacy of his family say for whom he is going to vote, because that would be regarded as affecting an election.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we propose to do that we ought to take the further step and prevent those who are making money out of governmental contracts from making contributions to any political party; to prevent them from making contributions which may be considered in some instances as bribery in order to secure governmental contracts for themselves.

Senators, we talk about controlling the subordinates of the State governments and the Federal Government. The greatest source of corruption in American politics today is the use of money obtained from those who make profit out of contracts with the Government.

I shall not take up the time of the Senate, because I know we are approaching a vote on the proposed legislation, but I want to appeal to the Senator from New Mexico. I know his great power in connection with the legislation. I know—and I have seen it happen here for a week—that every amendment which has been offered has been voted down if he disapproved it. I ask him not to kill his own child. It is true that this baby has been sleeping peacefully for 5 years, but he can breathe the breath of life into that child which was born 5 years ago by making this amendment a part of the bill.

Mr. President, the amendment is offered with no hostile purpose in mind whatsoever. It is offered in entire sympathy with the philosophy of the bill. I hope the amendment, which is identical in language with the measure which the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Virginia offered 5 years ago, will be made a part of the bill.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I should like to have an amendment read so it would not be caught under the limitation of 20 minutes before 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Nothing in this act shall prohibit any official or employee subject to its provisions from becoming a candidate or accepting a nomination for an appointive or elective office or position, provided such official or employee shall not use his official authority or influence to secure such nomination or appointment, and further provided that such official or employee shall resign from his office or employment upon receipt of such nomination or appointment.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have a very short amendment read at the desk also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place in the bill the following new section:

SEC. —. Section 9 (a) of said act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by inserting after the words "political subjects", in the ninth line of said subdivision (a), the following: "and candidates."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I could not help but feel gratification and take some pleasure at the remarks of the

Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He stated quite correctly that the bill was introduced in April 1935 by me and the Senator from Virginia. The bill then offered and the amendment he offered today strike at one of the most corrupting influences in politics, and certainly I am not going to stand on the floor of the Senate today and ask the Senate not to adopt this amendment, in which I believe so firmly. On the contrary, Mr. President, I think the adoption of this amendment will vastly improve the pending measure. The entire subject would have been included by me originally if the original bill had not been confined to one subject, but we have included other matters in the bill now, and I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted.

There is one thing in connection with it, however, which I think should be corrected. I see in the first line—and probably this was my error in the first instance—that the prohibition runs against a corporation making a campaign contribution. As I understand, the present Corrupt Practices Act precludes and prohibits any campaign contribution by a corporation. This might be construed as lessening or loosening in some degree the present Corrupt Practices Act, and rather than do that I will ask the Senator from Virginia if he will not agree that we may strike out the words "or corporation" where they appear in the amendment; and after the word "firm", strike out the words "or corporation" where they appear in the amendment. And also that there be inserted between "person" and "firm" the word "or", so as to read "no person or firm."

Mr. BYRD. I agree to the modification proposed by the Senator from New Mexico to the bill which he prepared 5 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has modified his amendment, which he has a right to do.

Mr. BYRD. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia, as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have offered a very simple amendment. In section 9 of the Hatch Act we find this language:

All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects.

I think the Senator from New Mexico was interrogated as to whether the word "subjects" included "candidates." I was under the impression that he thought it did. At any rate, I wish to add to that language the words "and candidates" so it will be certain.

In this particular case it is provided that the rules of the Civil Service Commission shall govern. Those rules expressly provide that civil-service employees are not permitted to speak in campaigns, if I recollect aright, and that they must not write or publish articles dealing with political campaigns. In other words, they are very stringently limited as to how they may express themselves with regard to political subjects.

I wish to add to the word "subjects" the words "and candidates." Under the restrictions of the Civil Service Commission I think no one should be denied the privilege of expressing opposition to a candidate or favor for a candidate. I think it touches very closely the arguments which have been made about school teachers having the right to approve or oppose the election of a superintendent of schools or director of public instruction.

Under the act as it now exists we have every protection against coercion. In section 2 officers are prohibited from using their official authority in any way to influence an election.

In section 3 we find that they are prohibited from using their power of employment to bribe people to vote either for subjects or for candidates.

In section 4 we find that they are prohibited from making any kind of threat whatever or exercising any form of coercion against an employee to induce him to vote for or against a certain subject or for or against a certain candidate.

In section 5 we find that officers having charge of employment are prohibited from soliciting or receiving any contributions.

Mr. President, it seems to me that by those sections of the law coercion or even inducement of those employed is prevented. We come, then, to the question of what liberties the employees shall have. The employees under the civil service are very much restricted in their liberties with regard to elections. They are allowed to express themselves on subjects. They should be allowed to express themselves on candidates. Under the restrictions which exist in the civil-service rules, namely, that they cannot make public speeches, that they cannot take part in management, that they cannot write or publish articles, they are limited solely to the right of expressing themselves for or against the candidate.

If we do not place the language of my amendment in the bill, every employee coming under this measure will be constantly in danger of losing his position, or at least being prosecuted, by reason of the fact that inadvertently he may sometime say to his wife, or to his son, or to a brother-in-law, "Well, I think JOHN GARNER should be the nominee of the Democratic Party."

I therefore insist that the amendment is a reasonable one.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the Senator proposing an amendment to the act we passed last year?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is an amendment to the general act.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the amendment may be defeated. The question which the Senator has raised has been discussed quite frequently on the floor, and I am quite sure that the act as it now is permits the doing of the things that the Senator is arguing for. But I do not want to loosen that act, and further extend its provisions.

Under the amendments which were made to the act permitting expression of opinion on all subjects, and eliminating the word "privately," I think the field was fully covered, and every needful protection given.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator is right in that matter, if this amendment means exactly what the Senator means, why take a chance on the Civil Service Commission? There is one thing we seem to agree is included, and knowing that that is included in the word "subject," why not say so?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. (Putting the question.) The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BROWN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROWN. It is very obvious that the calling of the roll will take up the entire time between now and 3 o'clock. In that case those of us who have amendments—and I have one on the desk which is agreeable to the Senator from New Mexico—cannot have the amendments considered, as there will not be time to have them read or discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour has passed when new amendments may be offered.

Mr. BROWN. But the amendment I refer to is on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments on the desk may be called up for action.

Mr. BROWN. Do I understand that by this maneuver no more explanations may be made from now on as to the purpose of the amendments?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that I do not think his use of the word "maneuver" is a happy one. We have the same right to have a roll call with respect to the pending amendment as to others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Michigan that although the yeas and nays have been ordered, if the Senator from Michigan desires to

make an explanation of his amendment at this time he may do so.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask particularly the attention of the Senator from New Mexico. My proposed amendment states that no employee of a State government, or of a municipal government, or of any agency thereof, is barred from being a candidate if he takes a leave of absence during the time.

Mr. HATCH. That amendment relates only to State officials?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Did the Senator submit it to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as the remarks of the Senator from Michigan referring to the demand for the yeas and nays as a "maneuver" are concerned, the Senator from Missouri would like to say that if that is a maneuver, a similar maneuver took place in the Constitutional Convention, because that was where the right of having the yeas and nays was guaranteed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I withdraw the word "maneuver." I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROWN. The Bankhead amendment as it passed the Senate, as I understood—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon raises a point of order that the Senate is not in order. The Senator is perfectly correct. There is so much confusion on the floor of the Senate that it is almost impossible for those at the desk to hear what is going on. The Senate will be in order, and the Chair asks the occupants of the gallery to be as quiet as possible.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry I desire to make is this: On page 2852 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14 the Bankhead amendment limiting campaign contributions to \$5,000 contains, in its subsection (d), the following language:

Any amount expended, contributed, furnished, or advanced by one person, directly or indirectly, in excess of \$5,000 is hereby declared to be excessive financial aid.

According to the RECORD, it appears that the Senate adopted the amendment in that manner. I understand from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that his amendment as submitted did not contain the words "or corporation" in subsection (d). I now ask the Senator if I am correct in that statement?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If necessary, I rise to a question of personal privilege, because there has been criticism of my draftsmanship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama withhold his question of personal privilege until the Chair has had an opportunity to answer the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some objection was made to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] proceeding on this subject, and I wanted to aid—

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think I can satisfy the Chair that this is a parliamentary inquiry. I ask what the language was which was actually agreed to. What was the language of the Bankhead amendment which was submitted? Did it contain the words "or corporation" or not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the official record does not contain the words on which the question has been raised.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected to show that the amendment as adopted did not contain the words "or corporation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is recognized on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, my only purpose in rising to a question of personal privilege is to answer the statement of Mr. Weir, the Republican money collector, that this amendment had been carelessly drafted. I do not intend to engage in any cross criticism, but Mr. Weir was merely misinformed. I corrected the original amendment, as it appears on page 2720 of the RECORD, and presented an amendment omitting all reference to corporations and their officers, and stated that it was done to avoid any controversy about its effect on the Corrupt Practices Act. That was well understood in the Senate.

I first offered an amendment containing the figure \$1,000. That appears in the RECORD on page 2790. The amendment did not contain the word "corporation." The next morning I offered a similar amendment, with the statement, which appears in the RECORD, that the only change in the amendment then offered was to change the figure "\$1,000" to "\$5,000." So it is perfectly clear all the way through the RECORD that the word "corporation" was omitted; and I am advised that the official Journal of the Senate for that day so states. I therefore ask unanimous consent, merely to clarify the situation and to avoid confusion, to have reprinted following my remarks a copy of the Journal entry as to the contents of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the Journal entry will be printed at this point.

The Journal entry is as follows:

On motion by Mr. BANKHEAD to further amend the part proposed to be inserted by the reported amendment, as amended, by inserting on page 7, after line 18, the following:

"Sec. — (a) Excessive financial aid to any candidate for an elective Federal office is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(b) Excessive financial aid to any political committee or political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the election of any candidate or political party nominees for a Federal office, or any committee engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the success of any national political party is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(c) Presidential electors and the President of the United States for the purpose of this act are declared to be elective officers.

"(d) Any amount expended, contributed, furnished, or advanced by one person, directly or indirectly, in violation of this section in excess of \$5,000 is hereby declared to be excessive financial aid.

"(e) Any person who directly or indirectly contributes more than \$5,000 during any calendar year or for use in any one campaign or election, in violation of the provisions of this section, is guilty of pernicious political activity, and on conviction, shall be fined not less than \$5,000 and also sentenced to the penitentiary for not exceeding 5 years."

It was determined in the affirmative, yeas, 40; nays, 38.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I have had upon the desk for several days an amendment with which Senators are familiar. I wish to take a moment to explain it, because it is due to come to a vote.

Section 2 of the Hatch Act provides that any one in politics who uses his official authority to influence an election commits a crime. For this crime he may be punished by a fine of \$1,000, or imprisonment in jail for 1 year, or both. If anyone uses his official authority to influence an election he commits a crime. That is a provision of section 2. I simply wish to include in that category not only politicians, but also employers of labor and lenders of money at interest.

We have said in the first section of the Hatch Act that no one shall coerce or threaten anyone else in the exercise of his franchise. Coming down to the next section, which deals with the use of official authority, making it a crime to use official authority to influence an election, I wish to provide that such conduct shall be a crime not only for politicians, who hold political jobs, but also for those who employ labor and those who lend money at interest. I am in favor of the section as far as it goes. However, I wish to include in the same category those who employ labor and those who lend money at interest in order than they may not use their

positions as employers of labor and lenders of money to oppress anyone in an election.

Senators know that no one is so oppressive in politics as a banker. If a banker holds a mortgage against the home of a person, he can threaten him with foreclosure of the mortgage on his home. He has a strangle hold. Some of the most pernicious politicians I have known in my life have been bankers. We have some of them in southern Indiana who play the highest-handed kind of politics, and I want to reach them under this act. I want to provide that they may not use their banks in order to carry out their purpose in politics.

The other day while I had the floor I mentioned this amendment, and a county chairman from my State happened to be in the gallery. I saw him afterward, and he said, "Of course, bankers are the worst politicians we have to deal with." He told me about an election for superintendent of schools in his county. The township trustees elect the superintendent of schools. There were the same number of Democrats as Republicans on the board. There was a tie vote, but the banker of the town was a Republican, and he wanted a Republican superintendent of schools, so he called in one of the Democrats who expected to vote for a Democratic superintendent of schools and said, "We have a mortgage on your place, and if you do not vote for the Republican candidate for superintendent of schools we will foreclose the mortgage." Of course, what the Democrat did was to vote for the Republican candidate for superintendent of schools. That sort of thing happens. Senators know that it happens.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Republican keep his promise not to foreclose the mortgage?

Mr. MINTON. Oh, yes. He kept his promise, because the township trustee had delivered his vote for the Republican candidate for superintendent of schools.

Everybody knows that the bankers use their power over the people to whom they have loaned money to oppress them in the matter of their votes. All I want to do is to put the bankers of Indiana and other States in the same category with the rest of us. We may not use our official authority to influence an election. I want to say to the bankers that they may not, the day before election, bring in the people on whose property they hold mortgages and say, "If you do not vote the way we want you to vote tomorrow, we will foreclose the mortgage on your homes." I want to say to those who employ labor that they may not herd the laborers in the day before election and say to them, "You vote the way we want you to vote, or we will close the factory."

Why should not bankers and employers of labor be in the same category as politicians? They are in the same category in the first section, as to intimidation and coercion. I want to put them under the provisions of section 2, which says that official authority may not be used to influence or control an election. I want to say that the man who lends money at interest and the man who employs labor shall not use their money or positions to influence or control elections. This section applies only to Federal elections, with respect to which we have ample authority.

That is all my amendment does. It is in perfect harmony with the objective of the bill, which seeks to protect the people in the exercise of their franchise, and to protect the freedom of elections. I hope that when the time comes it will be agreed to. There can be no question about the amendment being in thorough harmony with all the purposes of the bill. It is merely a broadening of the base of section 2 to include employers of labor and lenders of money, so that they may not use their positions as employers of labor and lenders of money to drag in some poor unfortunate fellow and tell him how he shall vote on election day. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it seems to be in order to explain amendments. I had an amendment read from the desk. The reason for its submission was that on yesterday the Senate adopted as part of the law the regulations of the

Civil Service Commission and the interpretations which it had put upon the words "political activity" and "participation in campaigns." Subsection 30 of those regulations absolutely forbids candidacy for a nomination or election by anyone governed by the act. That is, the Federal inspector of meats in a packing plant, who might have an opportunity to run for county clerk or for sheriff, is absolutely barred. It seemed to me that the regulation which the Civil Service Commission adopted was perfectly proper as related to persons who have permanent positions, that is, those in continuing positions in the civil service. It is perfectly proper to stop them from being candidates while under permanent tenure. However, the man who holds a petty Federal place, subject to termination with a change of administration, or subject to discharge at the will of his employer without cause or without reason, is entitled to an opportunity, if he wishes, to have his name submitted as a candidate for promotion or appointment, provided he does not violate any of the fundamentals. That is all I seek to do by the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the time will shortly arrive when further discussion of the various amendments which are to be voted on will not be permitted, a matter which I regret, in a way. I think amendments ought to be fully discussed if they are to be voted on.

I wish to say to the Senator from Indiana that I think the very thing he talked about is already prohibited in section 1. It was my design in drafting that section last year to do the very thing he is talking about. The Senator from Indiana was the first Member of the United States Senate to grasp the significance of section 1 in that connection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the Senator referring to the original act?

Mr. HATCH. I am referring to the original act which prohibits intimidation or coercion by any person against any other person at any election in which a Federal official is to be chosen. That includes the banker, the employer of labor, and everyone else.

As a matter of draftsmanship, section 2, to which the amendment is directed, refers to the use of official authority by officials. The banker or money lender, or the employer of labor, has no official authority that could be used. The amendment is simply out of place. The matter sought to be covered by the amendment is covered by section 1, and I am glad it is so covered.

As to the other amendments which are to be voted on, I told the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] that I would not object to his amendment, with respect to which he had conferred with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. However, in view of the fact that we are not permitted to discuss other amendments, I hope other amendments will be defeated, and that we may proceed to vote on the bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to add a new section 22, as follows:

Sec. 22. Section 9 (a) of said act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by inserting, after the words "political subjects", in the ninth line of said subdivision (a), the following: "and candidates."

So that the sentence shall read as follows:

All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and withhold my vote. If the Senator from Wisconsin were present, he would vote "nay" on this question, and if I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that, if present, he would vote "yea" on this question. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—44

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Lee	Pepper
Ashurst	Connally	Lucas	Pittman
Bailey	Donahay	Lundeen	Russell
Bankhead	Frazier	McCarran	Schwartz
Bilbo	Guffey	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Brown	Hayden	Maloney	Smathers
Bulow	Herring	Miller	Smith
Byrd	Hill	Minton	Stewart
Byrnes	Hughes	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Chavez	La Follette	Overton	Wheeler

NAYS—41

Austin	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Gibson	Mead	Tobey
Barkley	Gillette	Neely	Townsend
Bridges	Green	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Gurney	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hale	Radcliffe	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Reed	Walsh
Danaher	Holman	Reynolds	White
Davis	Holt	Sheppard	
Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Taft	
George	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Ellender	King	Truman
Bone	Glass	Shipstead	Wiley
Burke	Harrison	Slattery	

So Mr. PITTMAN's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The offering of amendments which were read prior to 2:40 p. m. is now in order.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to which the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Georgia have indicated that they have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

Sec. 19. Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent any person employed by the State government, the municipal government, or any agency thereof from becoming a bona fide candidate for any public office and engaging in any lawful political activity in furtherance of his candidacy in the event he takes a leave of absence without pay from his employment during the campaign.

Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent—

Any lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign at which there are no candidates on party tickets representing a party which polled votes for President in the last preceding national election; nor lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign respecting any issue not particularly identified with any national or State political party, such as revision of the Constitution of the United States or of a State; referendums, approval or disapproval, of city or municipal statutes or ordinances, and other issues of similar character.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. BROWN and Mr. MINTON called for a division.

On a division, there were ayes 50, noes 9.

So Mr. BROWN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have on the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall prohibit any official or employee subject to its provisions from becoming a candidate or accepting a nomination for an appointive or elective office or position, provided such official or employee shall not use his official authority or influence to secure such nomination or appointment: *And provided further*, That such official or employee shall resign from his office or employment upon receipt of such nomination or appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call for a division.

On a division, the ayes were 41, noes 39.

So the amendment of Mr. ADAMS was agreed to.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I discussed a few moments ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, after the comma, it is proposed to insert:

Any person who employs labor or lends money at interest.

Following the word "authority", in line 16, it is proposed to insert:

Or his position as employer of labor or lender of money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A division is called for. The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ayes are 32. The noes are 41.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment relative to the exemption of teachers in public schools and in State eleemosynary institutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 20. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, or cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, together with the officers and employees thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which has heretofore been printed and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after "(1)", it is proposed to insert "any officer or."

On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "administrative."

On page 2, line 4, after "(2)", it is proposed to insert "any officer."

On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "administrative."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated as that part of the bill will read if the amendment is agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated in such a way as to show how the bill will read if amended as proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. If the Senate will give me unanimous consent to do so, I think I can explain the amendment in a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent to explain the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let the amendment be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. As proposed to be amended, section 2 would read:

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for (1) any officer or any person employed in any position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) any officer or any person employed in any position by any State, by any political subdivision or municipality of any State, or by any agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality or agency)—

And so forth.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. In a comparison of the amendment with the text of the bill before me—and I will ask the Chair to follow me and tell me whether I am correct or not—on page 2, line 4, after "(2)", the amendment proposes to insert the words "any officer." I find no such figure in line 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator evidently has the late print. The Chair is following the first print. All amendments refer to the first print.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" have it.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the ayes are 16, the noes are 52, so the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, my amendment on the clerk's desk, which defines political activities which are proscribed, has not been voted on, and I ask unanimous consent that section 3 be eliminated from the amendment, because that has been adopted. I withdraw section 3 of the amendment, which was adopted earlier in the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent to withdraw section 3 of his amendment. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be stated with section 3 eliminated.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, there is possibly a slight misunderstanding between the Senator from New Mexico and myself. The Senator from New Mexico tells me that he supposed I would not offer this amendment if he accepted a substitute for section 3. I did not understand it that way. But I take what the Senator says to be the fact, and I will not press the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not care to have the Senator think I am holding him to the agreement I have suggested.

Mr. BROWN. I understand the Senator's position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, on page 2, line 23—

Mr. HATCH. The time for offering amendments has expired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment evidently has not been offered in time. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BARKLEY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN's name was called). My colleague is unavoidably detained from the Senate on important public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRD. My colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably absent. I am requested by him to announce that were he present he would vote in the negative.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. The Senator from Virginia is not present, and I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—58

Ashurst	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Gerry	McCarran	Taft
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	Gillette	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Green	Murray	Tobey
Bridges	Gurney	Neely	Townsend
Capper	Hale	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Hatch	Nye	Vandenberg
Chandler	Herring	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Radcliffe	Walsh
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	White
Downey	La Follette	Russell	
Frazier	Lee	Schwartz	

NAYS—28

Adams	Byrnes	Hughes	Pepper
Bailey	Chavez	Lucas	Pittman
Bankhead	Connally	Lundeen	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Donahay	McKellar	Smathers
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Smith
Bulow	Hayden	Miller	Stewart
Byrd	Hill	Minton	Thomas, Okla.

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Glass	Shipstead	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Slattery	Wiley
Ellender	King		

So the bill S. 3046 was passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed, including all the amendments agreed to, be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill, S. 3046, as passed by the Senate, is as follows:

An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for (1) any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) any person employed in any administrative position by any State, by any political subdivision or municipality of any State, or by any agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency), in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, or by any such department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States, to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possession."

Sec. 2. Section 10 of such act of August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. The provisions of this act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law."

Sec. 3. Such act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 12. (a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects. When used in the second sentence of this subsection, the term 'officer or employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or the Lieutenant Governor of any State or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil-service system; (3) officers holding elective offices.

"(b) If any Federal agency charged with the duty of making any loan or grant of funds of the United States for use in any activity in connection with which any function is exercised by any officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (a) are applicable has reason to believe that any such officer or employee has violated the provisions of such subsection, it shall make a report with respect thereto to the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'). Upon the receipt of any such report, or upon the receipt of any other information which seems to the Commission to warrant an investigation, the Commission shall forthwith by registered mail give notice to any such officer or employee and to the State or local agency employing such officer or employee of the pendency of the charge, in which notice shall be set forth a summary of the alleged violation and of the time and place for a hearing upon said charge, at which hearing (which shall be not earlier than 10 days thereafter) either the officer or employee or the State or local agency, or both, may appear with counsel and be heard, whereupon said Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred. If the Commission determines that any such violation has occurred, and that such violation warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, it shall notify the appropriate State or local agency of such determination, whereupon such officer or employee or the appropriate State, or both, shall have the right to appeal from any such finding to the next term of the United States district court for the district in which such officer or employee shall reside; and the United States district courts shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such appeal, and all proceedings therein shall be had in the same manner as is provided for appeals taken under section 39c, Public Law No. 696, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 22, 1938 (U. S. C., Supp. title 11, sec. 67c). No such officer or employee shall be dismissed as a result of such determination by said Commission and no loan or grant shall be withheld until said appeal shall be finally determined. Pending final determination of any such appeal, any such officer or employee previously found guilty of a violation of this section shall stand suspended. If in any case the Commission finds that such officer or employee has not been removed from his office or employment within a reasonable time after such notification, or that he has been so removed and has subsequently (within a period of 18 months) been appointed to any office or employment in any State or local agency in such State, the Commission shall certify the fact to the appropriate Federal agency, which shall thereupon withhold from its contributions, loan or grant to such State or local agency within such State, a sum twice the amount of the annual salary of such officer or employee.

"(c) In determining the amount to be withheld under subsection (b) on account of violations of subsection (a), the Commission shall take into account the nature of such violations and

the circumstances under which they occurred: *Provided*, That in no event shall loans or grants pledged by a State or local agency as security for its bonds or notes be withheld where such action would jeopardize the payment of principal or interest on such bonds or notes.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section. Any determination made by the Commission under this section shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the United States and all other persons.

"(e) The provisions of the first two sentences of section 12 (a) shall not apply to employees in an activity of a State or of a local agency not financed as to such particular activity in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'State or local agency' means the executive branch of any State, or of any municipality or other political subdivision of such State, or any agency or department thereof.

"(2) The term 'Federal agency' includes any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the United States (except a member bank of the Federal Reserve System).

"Sec. 13. (a) Excessive financial aid to any candidate for an elective Federal office is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(b) Excessive financial aid to any political committee or political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the election of any candidate or political party nominees for a Federal office, or any committee engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the success of any national political party is a pernicious political activity and is hereby declared to be illegal.

"(c) Presidential electors and the President of the United States for the purpose of this act are declared to be elective officers.

"(d) Any amount expended, contributed, furnished, or advanced by one person, directly or indirectly, in violation of this section in excess of \$5,000 is hereby declared to be excessive financial aid.

"(e) Any person who directly or indirectly contributes more than \$5,000 during any calendar year or for use in any one campaign or election, in violation of the provisions of this section, is guilty of pernicious political activity, and on conviction, shall be fined not less than \$5,000 and also sentenced to the penitentiary for not exceeding 5 years.

"Sec. 14. No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any officer or employee embraced by this section to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes.

"Sec. 15. For the purposes of this act, persons employed in the government of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be employed in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, except that for the purposes of the second sentence of section 9 (a) the Commissioners and the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia shall not be deemed to be officers or employees.

"Sec. 16. The provisions of this act which prohibit persons to whom such provisions apply from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns shall be deemed to prohibit the same activities on the part of such persons as the United States Civil Service Commission has heretofore determined are at the time of the passage of this act prohibited on the part of employees in the classified civil service of the United States by the provisions of the civil-service rules prohibiting such employees from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns.

"Sec. 17. Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons.

"Sec. 18. No person or firm entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, or performing any work or services for the United States or any department or agency thereof, or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land,

or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, shall, during the period of negotiation for, or performance or furnishing of, such contract, work, services, material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly, make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; nor shall any person knowingly solicit any such contribution from any such person or firm, for any such purpose during any such period. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"Sec. 19. Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent any person employed by the State government, the municipal government, or any agency thereof, from becoming a bona fide candidate for any public office and engaging in any lawful political activity in furtherance of his candidacy in the event he takes a leave of absence without pay from his employment during the campaign.

"Nothing in this act or in said act of August 2, 1939, shall be construed to prevent any lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign at which there are no candidates on party tickets representing a party which polled votes for President in the last preceding national election; nor lawful political activity in an election and the preceding campaign respecting any issue not particularly identified with any National or State political party, such as revision of the Constitution of the United States or of a State; referendums; approval or disapproval of city or municipal statutes or ordinances, and other issues of similar character.

"Sec. 20. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, or cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, together with the officers and employees thereof.

"Sec. 21. Nothing in this act shall prohibit any official or employee subject to its provisions from becoming a candidate or accepting a nomination for an appointive or elective office or position provided such official or employee shall not use his official authority or influence to secure such nomination or appointment: *And provided further*, That such official or employee shall resign from his office or employment upon receipt of such nomination or appointment.

"Sec. 22. Section 9 (a) of said act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by inserting after the words 'political subjects,' in the ninth line of said subdivision (a), the following: 'and candidates.'

"Sec. 23. As used in this act, the term 'State' means any State, Territory, or possession of the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1750. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; and

S. 2739. An act to amend section 45 of the United States Criminal Code to make it applicable to the outlying possessions of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8641) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8641) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8202, the general appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the misinformation which has been going the rounds in regard to the extent of the amendments approved by the Committee on Appropriations to the pending bill, I feel that, in justice to the committee, I should make a general statement in regard to the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is one of the most important bills that has been before the Senate, and I ask that we have better order so that we can hear the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The confusion is very largely caused by large numbers of the occupants of the galleries leaving and others entering. The Doorkeepers will preserve order in the galleries, and the Senate will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending legislation, the agricultural appropriation bill, provides for the most far-flung and varied activities of Government of any measure considered each year by the Congress. Something like 2,000 different projects related to almost every conceivable phase of plant, animal, and human life are supported by the funds carried in this measure.

After having wrestled with this bill for 6 years, I am convinced that it is beyond the ability of any one human being to familiarize himself in detail with the scope and extent of all of the work that is done or supposed to be done in the program carried on by this Department.

The task of the committee handling this bill is always a difficult one. Not only are the hearings where departmental witnesses testify rather tedious and involved, but this bill also attracts a large number of persons who wish to present problems which peculiarly affect their business or section in an effort to obtain appropriations to help with their solution.

These witnesses, some representing national organizations, come before the committee with recommendations for appropriations to help with the solution of their problems.

Senators are familiar with the fact that the Bureau of the Budget this year dealt very drastically with the recommendations of the Department affecting agricultural appropriations. There are four different sets of figures that are sometimes used in explaining the amount of money that is involved in the agricultural appropriation bill. Each set of figures includes different items. One of those sets of figures applies only to the new money that is appropriated. Another contains the so-called new money that is appropriated and, as well, the reappropriations, but excludes trust funds and co-operative funds.

There is another which contains new money and the permanent appropriations. It has always been my thought that the figures which more truly represented a true picture of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture were those which included funds from all sources, the new money that was appropriated, the permanent appropriations that are established by law, the amount of reappropriations, co-operative funds, and funds from all sources that are included in the agricultural bill or by existing law, and which will be available to the Department of Agriculture for expenditure in a given year.

Using those figures, the amount of the appropriations for the year 1940, being funds that are available from all sources, amounted to about \$1,428,334,430. When the Bureau of the Budget undertook the consideration of this bill to make its recommendations to the Congress this amount was reduced to \$864,000,000. That is a reduction by the Bureau of the Budget of \$564,000,000, or approximately a 40-percent cut in the appropriations as contained in the legislation for the current year.

When the bill reached the House of Representatives the House proceeded to make still further reductions, though the Bureau of the Budget had already cut the appropriations for the agricultural activities of the country to the bone. The bill as it passed the House appropriated \$796,973,132, or a reduction below the appropriations for the year 1940 of \$631,000,000, being a reduction of 44 percent that had been leveled against the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves that figure will he now tell me how the \$796,000,000 appropriated by the House compared with the Budget estimate?

Mr. RUSSELL. The \$796,000,000 appropriated by the House compared with Budget estimates of \$864,000,000, being a reduction below the Budget estimate.

Mr. President, I might say, to be perfectly fair, that \$60,000,000 of money that was contained in the bill as it passed the House has been made available immediately to the Department for use in the soil-conservation program under the provisions of the first deficiency act, which has, as I understand, passed both branches of Congress. And in all fairness that amount of money should be added to the Budget estimates, to the House figures, and to the Senate figures, because that amount was made available earlier than the next fiscal year in order to bring the conservation program into line.

I might say further that the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the farm-tenancy program, which have heretofore been made as direct appropriations by the Congress, were dealt with differently this year by the committee. The committee will offer amendments which will provide that the funds for these two activities of the Department shall be obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, just as other loan programs of the Government are handled. This involves legislation, and the committee could not under the rules include it in the bill, but authorized me to offer it from the floor.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended that the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration be handled in that manner. The committee, after going into the fine record of repayments that have been made by those who have borrowed funds in order to become home owners under the farm-tenant purchase program, concluded that they were fully justified in also financing that program from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rather than from a direct appropriation from the Treasury.

Mr. President, I ask that table A, showing Department of Agriculture appropriations, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE A.—Department of Agriculture appropriations (inclusive of "Loans, relief, and rural rehabilitation" carried in emergency relief acts, permanent appropriations, and trust funds)

	Appropriation, 1940	Budget estimate, 1941 ¹			House bill, 1941 ¹			Senate committee bill, 1941		
		Amount	Reduction below 1940		Amount	Reduction below 1940		Amount	Reduction below 1940	
			Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
Total appropriations (includes reappropriations) On this basis, House bill is below Budget estimates \$67,028,535, or 7.8 percent. Senate committee bill is above Budget estimates \$203,240,049, or 24 percent.	\$1,428,334,430	\$864,001,667	—\$564,332,763	40	\$796,973,132	—\$631,361,298	44	\$1,067,241,716	—\$361,092,714	25
Total direct appropriations (excludes reappropriations) On this basis, House bill is below Budget estimates \$67,028,535, or 8.0 percent. Senate committee bill is above Budget estimates \$201,940,049, or 24 percent.	1,290,289,427	832,976,664	—457,312,763	35	765,948,129	—524,341,298	41	1,034,916,713	—255,372,714	20

¹ Exclusive of \$60,000,000 for "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources" to offset similar amount now in first deficiency appropriation bill, 1940.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to the fact that, whereas the total amount of over-all reductions in the Budget submitted to the Congress upon its convening in January amounted to 8 percent, the bill for the agricultural interests of the country was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget by approximately 40 percent. I have stated on the floor of the Senate previously that there is nothing in the general farm picture, nor in any evidence that was submitted to the Appropriations Committee in the consideration of this bill, to justify this tremendous and disproportionate reduction in the agricultural appropriation bill.

The committee was confronted with these alternatives. We could either accept the bill as it came before us with these drastic reductions made by the Bureau of the Budget, and accentuated in the House, and by so doing slash the very heart out of the farm program, and reduce still further the farmer's already diminished and pathetic share of the national income, or we could proceed to exercise our own judgment in writing appropriations that we considered the very minimum under which the farm program could operate in the year 1941.

In my opinion the amount provided by the Senate amendments is the very minimum on which the farm program can operate. And certainly if any reductions are made in the total recommended by the committee to the Senate the farmer will be compelled to bear an unfair proportion of the reduction in the National Budget.

Having deducted the exchange of the \$60,000,000 in the first deficiency bill, and the rearrangement of funds provided for in the pending bill, by transfer to loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the bill as reported to the Senate by your committee is \$361,000,000 below the appropriations for the current year, or a reduction of approximately 25 percent. And I challenge anyone to show a reduction of 25 percent in any other general appropriation bill that has heretofore been or will hereafter be passed by the Congress to operate an active program which continues from year to year.

The committee has endeavored to be as careful as possible in this matter. Some of the members of the committee exercised considerable self-restraint, and did not even offer amendments providing for appropriations for purposes in which they have been interested for years—amendments, I might say, that have been approved by the Senate on more than one occasion.

There has been a great deal of criticism of the committee, particularly on the part of a large section of the metropolitan press, because the committee recommendations exceed the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for this measure.

It is always pleasant to stay within the budgetary limitations on any bill, but it is not the duty of the Congress to be

bound absolutely by the recommendations of that agency as to any specific item or any single bill.

The recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget are merely advisory to the Congress. They are vastly important, because the Federal activities have so increased of recent years that it is difficult for the Congress to make a detailed investigation of every item in every appropriation bill.

The recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget should be considered; but if the Budget proposes unfair and unequal reductions in the appropriation for any one of the departments or activities, particularly in the case of the farm bill, dealing as it does with the most underprivileged and hard-pressed group in the United States, then I do not think the Congress should feel that it is absolutely bound by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. Speaking for myself, I do not feel bound by such recommendations.

Mr. President, I think I am as familiar with the needs of the farmer in my immediate section as is any clerk in the Bureau of the Budget who formulates the recommendations which come to us. Other Senators have had vastly more experience and are infinitely better prepared to pass judgment on the matter of agricultural appropriations than is any individual who is connected with the Bureau of the Budget.

Senators have observed, from their study of the bills appropriating funds for the maintenance of other departments, that many of them have already been allowed increases by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Congress for the year 1941 when the bill for 1941 is compared with the appropriations for 1940. Not a single bill has even approximated the reductions which have been made in the agricultural appropriation bill. I might point out, for example, that the Bureau of the Budget, in its recommendations to the Congress for appropriations for its own maintenance, suggested an increase of 22 percent over the appropriations for the current year. Congress has approved that increase in the appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget. I cannot avoid expressing the hope that all the new clerks and employees who are hired with the 22-percent increase will not be put to work on still further cutting the estimates for agricultural appropriations. If the Bureau of the Budget had approached all the other appropriation bills with the same zeal and enthusiasm which it manifested in dealing with the farm bill, the Budget would have been balanced this year; and I should have had more respect for the recommendations of that Bureau had it dealt more equitably in distributing reductions among all the appropriation measures which come before the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not wish to appear unduly critical of the Bureau of the Budget. From my service on the Committee on Appropriations I realize the magnitude of the task of dealing with the thousands of items found in all the appropriation bills, but in the last analysis the amount of the appropriation which the Congress should make for any specific

agency is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress. If we are to be absolutely bound by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, we might as well do away with our duty of appropriating and save much time and trouble.

The larger part of the increases made in the bill by the Senate committee is found in the amendment proposing an appropriation for parity payments to farmers and in the amendment appropriating funds to supplement permanent appropriations to be expended under the provisions of section 32 of the act of 1935. The parity-payment amendment contains a provision that no payment will be made with respect to any commodity in the event the average farm price of such commodity is more than 75 percent of the parity price, nor shall any payment exceed an amount which will be sufficient to bring the farmer 75 percent of parity.

The President, in his message transmitting the Budget, emphasized a fact which is known to every intelligent person in this country by stating that "agriculture is still not receiving its proper share of the national income." He explains the omission of estimates for parity payments in these words:

I have not, however, included estimates for new appropriations for parity payments in 1941. I am influenced by the hope that next year's crops can be sold by their producers for at least 75 percent of parity. I do not suggest in any way the abandonment of the policy of parity payments heretofore adopted, and future events may call for some appropriation to this end. I note, however, in passing, that the Congress has failed to make any provision for the financing of these payments already made or obligated for 1938 and 1939 crops.

As I have heretofore stated, the 75-percent limitation contained in the committee amendment carries out the idea expressed by the President in his Budget message. It will not result in any outlay whatever from the National Treasury if the hoped-for increase in farm prices expressed by the President and shared by millions throughout the country becomes a reality. However, the economists and expert witnesses who appeared before the committee, including the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of large farm organizations, all painted a gloomy picture of the probable effect of the European and Asiatic wars on the prices of farm commodities. Many persons anticipate increases in farm prices. The witnesses were all of the opinion that the experience of the agricultural interests in this war would not parallel the experience in 1917 and 1918, when farm prices skyrocketed.

It has been suggested that we might wait until next year and see what happens; and if farm prices are lower at that time Congress might then appropriate funds for parity payments. Those familiar with the farm program know that such a course would be disastrous to the farmer and absolutely destructive to the farm program. The farmer is entitled to know, before he prepares his land and plants his crop, just what he may expect in the way of parity and soil-conservation payments if he cooperates with the farm program. If no provision is made to give him some assurance that he will receive at least 75 percent of parity for crops on his allotted acreage, no one can blame him for failing to cooperate with the farm program and for seeking to overcome by increased production any decrease in the market price of his commodities which he may apprehend.

The appropriation for this year has failed to bring the producers of the basic commodities to 75 percent of parity. Taking the farm prices of the basic commodities and adding the parity payments, which have been made or will be made this year, the Department of Agriculture estimates that wheat will approach 68.6 percent of parity, corn will be 69.7 percent of parity, and cotton 65.8 percent of parity. Therefore the committee felt justified in putting the farmer on notice now that the amount recommended by the committee will be available to augment the decreased prices of farm commodities in the event the war should not bring about the increases in farm prices which the President suggested in his Budget message.

This appropriation is in the nature of an insurance fund to the farmer who cooperates with the farm program. It seeks to guarantee him at least 75 percent of what the Congress has said is a fair price; but the amount contained in the bill will not assure the farmer 75 percent of parity unless

there is some increase in the market prices of the basic commodities.

Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD statements showing parity prices of the five basic commodities, as well as the farm prices of the same commodities on Friday, March 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The statements are as follows:

Parity prices Feb. 15, 1940

Cotton.....	cents per pound.....	15.87
Corn.....	cents per bushel.....	82.2
Wheat.....	do.....	113.2
Rice.....	cents per hundredweight.....	231.3
Tobacco:		
Flue-cured.....	cents per pound.....	18.2
Dark.....	do.....	9.8
Burley.....	do.....	16.9
Cigar type 41.....	do.....	10.7
Other cigar filler and binder.....	do.....	14.2

*Farm prices of certain commodities on Friday,
Mar. 8, 1940*

Cotton.....	cents per pound.....	10
Wheat.....	cents per bushel.....	86.7
Corn.....	do.....	55
Rice.....	cents per hundredweight.....	153.0
Tobacco:		
Flue-cured.....	cents per pound.....	15.2
Burley.....	do.....	17.4
Dark.....	do.....	8.6
Pennsylvania.....	do.....	13.6
Other cigar, binder, and filler.....	do.....	14.7

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to tire the Senate with a lengthy discussion of the general condition of the farmer, as compared with other groups in this country. We all know that he is not receiving his fair share of the national income. Slightly more than 25 percent of the people of this country are living upon farms and receiving approximately 7 percent of the total national income. In my opinion the day is not far distant when the Congress of the United States will be compelled to deal with this problem on a basis other than trying to afford the farmer only 75 percent of justice. Justice to the farmer is long past due. The Secretary of Agriculture stated before the committee that it would be necessary to increase the farm income at least another one and a half billion dollars in order to place the income of the farmers on a parity with the income of other groups. He submitted statistics showing that on January 15 of this year, when farm prices were slightly higher, due to speculative influences brought about by the war, farm income was 99 percent of the pre-war parity from 1909 to 1914, that period having been designated by the Congress as the parity period, while the average price of the things which the farmer buys, including interest and taxes, was 128 percent. This reduces the purchasing power of farm commodities, as compared with the prices of the goods the farmer buys, to only 77 percent. Bear in mind that the figure of 77 percent applies to all farm purchasing power. The purchasing power of the so-called basic commodities for which parity appropriations are made is much lower than the over-all average of 77 percent.

The Secretary very graphically illustrated the unequal position of the farmer as compared with other groups by producing two mail-order catalogs, such as are seen in practically every farm home in the United States. One of the catalogs was for the year 1913, in the middle of the so-called parity period, when our economy was supposed to be on an even keel. The other catalog was for the year 1940. The Secretary selected a few items which are essential to farm life, such as work shirts, overalls, common nails, spike-tooth harrows, and other articles which are absolutely essential to farm life, and showed how the increases in the cost of industrial products had far outstripped the prices of farm commodities. I commend to the attention of all Members of the Senate the tables which appear in the printed hearings of the Appropriations Committee, in which the Secretary not only shows the prices in dollars and cents of these articles but breaks them down in terms of the quantity of the commodity which it is necessary to exchange for such articles

today as compared with the quantity of the commodity it would have been necessary to exchange in 1913.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the two tables which were submitted to the committee by the Secretary of Agriculture and which appear

in the record of the subcommittee hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the tables will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The tables are as follows:

TABLE C.—Comparative prices for selected articles, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 1913 and 1940

Article	Unit	1913 catalog			1940 catalog			Price change, 1913-40	
		Page Nos.	Number of items listed	Average price	Page Nos.	Number of items listed	Average price	Amount	Percent
Work shirts.....	Each.....	310-313	34	\$0.57	324-327	60	\$0.73	+\$0.16	+28
Overalls (bib).....	Pair.....	432-434	10	.70	319-323	18	.97	+.27	+39
Men's suits.....	Each.....	383-393	68	12.32	271-274, 277-279	34	18.08	+5.76	+47
Women's shoes.....	Pair.....	336-341, 343-346, 349-351	124	1.84	118, 119, 122-131	68	2.81	+.97	+53
Common nails, 8d.....	100 pounds..	1100	1	2.10	896	1	3.65	+1.55	+74
Axes, single bit, 4-pound head.....	Each.....	1102	8	.96	904	1	1.89	+.93	+97
Handsaws, 26 inches.....	Each.....	1110-1111	8	1.16	906	5	2.07	+.91	+78
Spike-tooth harrows, 2-section, 60-tooth.....	Each.....	1162	1	10.06	940	1	19.75	+9.69	+96
Corn planter, 2-row check.....	Each.....	1163	1	31.25	942	1	65.95	+34.70	+111

TABLE D.—Farm products equivalent in value to specified commodities, Jan. 15, 1913 and 1940

Commodities	Unit	Farm products											
		Pounds of cotton		Pounds of wool		Pounds of beef		Pounds of hogs		Bushels of wheat		Bushels of corn	
		1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940	1913	1940
Work shirts.....	Each.....	4.7	7.2	3.1	2.6	10.6	10.6	8.4	14.0	0.73	0.86	1.1	1.4
Overalls.....	Pair.....	5.8	9.6	3.8	3.5	13.0	14.1	10.3	18.7	.90	1.15	1.4	1.8
Men's suits.....	Each.....	102.0	179.0	66.0	64.0	228.0	262.0	181.0	348.0	15.8	21.4	25.0	34.0
Women's shoes.....	Pair.....	15.0	28.0	9.9	10.0	34.0	41.0	27.0	54.0	2.4	3.3	3.7	5.3
Common nails, 8d.....	100 pounds..	17.0	36.0	11.3	13.0	39.0	53.0	31.0	70.0	2.7	4.3	4.2	6.9
Axes, single bit, 4-pound head.....	Each.....	7.9	18.7	5.2	6.7	18.0	27.0	14.0	36.0	1.2	2.2	1.9	3.6
Handsaws, 26 inches.....	Each.....	9.6	20.5	6.2	7.4	22.0	30.0	17.0	40.0	1.5	2.4	2.3	3.9
Spike-tooth harrows, 2-section, 60-tooth.....	Each.....	83.0	196.0	54.0	70.0	186.0	286.0	148.0	380.0	12.9	23.4	20.0	37.0
Corn planter, 2-row check.....	Each.....	258.0	653.0	168.0	235.0	570.0	956.0	460.0	1,268.0	40.0	78.0	63.0	124.0

Mr. RUSSELL. In terms of farm products, to use an illustration anyone can understand, in 1913 8.4 pounds of hogs would purchase an ordinary work shirt. In 1940 it requires 14 pounds of hogs to buy the same shirt.

In 1913 the farmer could have exchanged 4.7 pounds of raw cotton for a cotton work shirt. In 1940 it requires 7.2 pounds of raw cotton to purchase the same cotton shirt.

In 1913, when the farmer went to town to buy a pair of shoes for his wife, he was required to exchange only 2.4 bushels of wheat for the pair of shoes. In 1940 he is required to exchange 3.3 bushels of wheat for the same pair of shoes.

In the normal year 1913 39 pounds of beef could have been exchanged for 100 pounds of common eightpenny nails. Today the farmer is required to exchange 53 pounds of beef for the same nails.

In 1913 the corn farmer could exchange 63 bushels of corn for a two-row corn planter. Today he is compelled to exchange 124 bushels of corn for the same article, which is essentially the same as it was in 1913.

An ordinary 4-pound ax could have been purchased in 1913 for 7.9 pounds of cotton, as compared with 18.7 pounds of cotton today.

Eighteen pounds of beef would have bought the ax in 1913. It takes 27 pounds of beef today.

One and two-tenths bushels of wheat, or 1.9 bushels of corn, could have been exchanged for that ax in 1913. Today it takes 2.2 bushels of wheat or 3.6 bushels of corn to acquire the same ax.

We may use practically every essential of farm life, whether it is clothing, tools, or supplies, in this simple computation. Even a wayfaring man should be able to understand the tremendous handicap and disadvantage of the farmer in his efforts to eke out a bare existence for himself and family when we consider the unusual requirements in the exchange of his commodities for industrial products today, as compared with the quantity that was required in the exchange in 1913.

I have observed that practically all the prospective candidates for the Presidential nomination of both the major parties have come out and assured the farmer that they are in favor of parity for the farmer. A very active candidate from the State of New York the other day came forward with an eight-point program for the benefit and relief of the American farmer, and the first of those eight points was a promise to the farmer of full parity for that which he produced. But a day or two after this candidate from New York came out with the assurance that he stood for parity, I observed in the press a statement from the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on the minority side, who is also from New York, stating that the farmer is already obtaining parity, and criticizing the Senate committee for recommending this small amount as a contribution toward parity payments. I certainly hope that the parity about which the candidate talks is not the kind of parity which suits and pleases the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee of the House from the same State.

The articles which I have enumerated—plows, shoes, shirts, and so forth—are the very minimum requirements for life and common decency on the farm or elsewhere. If we leave this field of essentials and go to nonessentials such as electric current, electrical appliances, the amount spent for amusements, going to moving-picture shows or to the corner drug-store, even greater disparity is displayed, to the disadvantage of the farmer. These things that other groups have come to consider as ordinary articles of life are considered luxuries by the farmer, and he is unable to obtain them with the low income now available to him.

Desirable legislation for other groups has, of course, contributed to this disparity in the purchasing power of farm commodities. We have passed here the wage and hour law, which placed a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours, for the benefit of industrial employees. Any increase in the cost of production of commodities has, of course, been re-

flected in the prices of the things the farmer buys. The farmer has very little wage, and very long hours. His purchasing power has been constantly shrinking as the compensation and standards of other groups have gone up. We have imposed Federal taxes on pay rolls to finance our fine social-security program. These taxes likewise are reflected in the retail prices of the products of industry. The farmer makes his contribution to these funds to pay old-age pensions and unemployment insurance every time he purchases one of the products essential to his existence; but in the nature of things he is barred from the security afforded by these laws.

We have the highest tariff rates the Nation has ever seen. Very little has been done to break down that wall, which costs the farmer millions of dollars each year. We have passed coal laws, attempting to guarantee the price of coal. The farmer may not use coal in his home. He is nevertheless required to contribute to increasing the price of coal, because all the products he buys must pay the tax to hold up coal prices at some stage in the manufacture of all industrial commodities.

We have passed the "hot oil" bill to put up the price of the oil and gasoline the farmer has to use in his tractors in his farming operations. We have helped all other groups with artificial devices but the farmer is farther from parity and equality of opportunity and income in this country than is any other group.

The farmer does not object to labor receiving good wages. He is in favor of labor legislation, and those with agricultural constituencies have helped enact labor laws. He is not against a fair return on capital investments.

He does demand, and his demand is just and fair, that he be accorded equal treatment with other groups who are beneficiaries of congressional action. The provisions of this bill are not adequate, but those of us who are concerned and disturbed about the farm problem were convinced we could go no farther in this bill. The Congress should enact, at this session, permanent legislation either fixing prices or levying taxes to give the farming population 100-percent equality. The Appropriations Committee cannot, of course, consider such legislation.

I am sure that any economist or any other person who has investigated the great disparity between farm income and the income of other groups will realize that the greatest and most pressing problem before the United States today is to attempt to assure the farmer a fair return on the products of his toil. Surely in common decency we cannot do less than approve this appropriation of \$212,000,000, a reduction of \$13,000,000 in the appropriation for parity for the present year, which is only designed to give to the farmer three-fourths of the slice of bread that is fully enjoyed by every other group in the country.

I regard it as unnecessary to elaborate on the other amendment which adds a substantial sum to the bill, this being the item of \$85,000,000 to supplement the 40 percent of customs receipts which is set aside for the operation of the surplus program under section 32 of the act of 1935. The customs receipts amount to \$100,000,000. Therefore, there will be available this year for the purposes defined in section 32 the sum of \$185,000,000 as compared with the sum of \$203,000,000 available for the same purpose during the current fiscal year. Senators will observe that the committee has made a substantial reduction in this item, as it has in the appropriation for parity payments.

The so-called stamp plan for the distribution of surplus commodities to those on relief, which has met with such great favor all over the country where tried, is financed from these funds, as is the distribution of surplus commodities to those who are on the relief rolls. It developed before the committee that in some States the only relief that was received by over 40 percent of those on the relief rolls was the surplus commodities that were purchased and distributed under the provisions of this appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the heading "Disposal of surplus commodities," to which the Senator has just been addressing his remarks, under section 32 of the act of 1935 the \$100,000,000 is an automatic appropriation, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not necessary to carry it in this bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a permanent appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That item is provided in section 32 of the act of 1935, which provides that 30 percent of all customs duties shall be set aside in a special fund for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture for the purposes set out in this section on page 83.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Texas was the author of this provision, which has been of great benefit to the agricultural interests of the country, as well as to those who are on the relief rolls.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for that statement. The point I am making is that the language is so broad that it authorizes not only the surplus-stamp plan but all these other plans. Our action has served the double purpose of not only relieving distress, and substituting the distribution of surplus commodities for direct relief where States and counties cannot provide direct relief, but it has also tended to reduce the surplus commodities on the agricultural list. Therefore, this particular provision serves a double purpose. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Texas is correct. Because of the great demands on the Federal Government from the States and from the localities for these surplus commodities by those in dire straits and because of the great demand from something like 700 cities in the Nation for the so-called stamp plan, some of us have been apprehensive that this program might be diverted from a farm program to a relief program. It is dual in its nature; but the intent of section 32, and I hope the operation of its administration in the Department of Agriculture, is clearly to keep it a farm program; but it has been of tremendous benefit to those who are out of employment and those who are not able to purchase even the bare necessities of life.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Entirely agreeing with the statement the Senator has just made regarding the utility of the surplus-commodity program, still I want to inquire the relationship between the \$85,000,000 and the Budget estimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Budget estimate was \$72,600,000, as I recall. I will say to the Senator that it was slightly in excess of \$72,000,000; so the recommendation of the committee, while substantially below the appropriation for the current year, is slightly in excess of the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. All those who regard the Budget as being a sacred thing, upon which no Member of the House or Member of the Senate should at any time lay hands, may take notice of that fact.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the appropriation for this year was \$113,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The direct appropriation to supplement section 32 funds for the current year was \$113,000,000.

Mr. HILL. The Budget Bureau recommended \$72,000,000 for this year. The committee has reported \$85,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact—I believe it is—that the scope of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, through the extension of its work in different cities throughout the country, is constantly increasing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say that at the time the hearings were first held before the committee the so-called stamp plan had been put into effect in 50 cities of the country. It is anticipated that by the first of July that plan will have been extended to 100 cities, whereas there are bona fide applications on file, accompanied by the assurance that the communities will assume their part of the responsibility for the plan, from more than 700 cities. It will be impossible to reach any considerable portion of the cities that have applied for this plan, but Senators must bear in mind that cities which do not distribute the surplus commodities through the stamp plan will continue to receive the commodities for direct distribution to those who are on the relief rolls. That service is reaching into almost every one of the 3,000 counties of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Will the Senator also state the information the committee had as to the cost of distribution by the State organizations as compared with the cost of distribution by the stamp plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It developed before the committee that the cost of direct distribution of surplus commodities was extremely high. Not only is it necessary for the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to pay the freight and transportation charges on commodities that are purchased—for example, if they buy a carload of butter in Wisconsin under this surplus-removal program and send it down to Georgia, there is a considerable item of transportation involved—but it required the expenditure of approximately \$19,000,000 by the States and local subdivisions of government to get these commodities into the hands of those using and eating them after the freight shipments had been delivered within the States. The stamp program, of course, reduces or eliminates almost altogether the administrative cost of the distribution of these commodities.

Mr. McKELLAR. And, Mr. President, wherever it has been tried out it has been very popular; much more so than the other plan.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I understand it has met with very general favor.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEE. How much would it take to make available the stamp plan to all the cities which are applying?

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked that question in the committee, and it is a very large sum. It would require the expenditure of \$360,000,000, according to the figures presented to us, to take this method of distribution into every community of the United States that is applying for it.

Mr. LEE. If the Senator will allow me an observation, Oklahoma has this plan in one city, and now the two largest cities in the State, Tulsa and Oklahoma City, are asking for the plan, and every report I hear on it is a good one.

It seems to me that it is a systematic way of doing what we are undertaking through the distribution of the commodities directly in a less systematic and perhaps definitely more expensive way.

Did the Senator's committee decide that we could not afford to appropriate enough to put the plan into all the cities which are applying for it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the matter of the amount of appropriations the committee could recommend with hope of final approval was taken into account. We considered that, confining it to a strictly agricultural program, and with the outlets of distribution only sufficient to handle the distribution of surpluses which might accumulate, the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations was a reasonable one. But if it is to be considered in the light of a relief program, it would undoubtedly not only dispose of the surplus, but would be a very effective weapon and machinery for dealing with the relief problem in the several communities of the country. However, I did not feel, particularly in view of the amount which has already been added to the bill, that the agricultural appropriation bill

should continue to bear all the burden of this expenditure, whether it was in the nature of a measure for relief or in the nature of a method of surplus disposal. I think it might be well for the Congress to give consideration, when the relief bill is presented, to the matter of extending the program on a wider scale. I do not think the funds should be contained in the pending bill, because, viewing it strictly from the standpoint of the distribution of surplus commodities, while this amount of money is not sufficient to take care of the distribution of the surplus, or to relieve the ill effects of the surplus, it is an amount which is commensurate with the appropriations heretofore made as well as other demands on the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Let me say, Mr. President, that the representatives of the Department expressed to me the thought that they were fully aware of the demand throughout the country, on the part of cities, for the extension of this service. In some States there has been some rivalry between cities. When one city has had the stamp plan inaugurated, some other city of the State has felt it should have it, and the officials of the Department appreciate the importance of having this Division of the Department of Agriculture, with the primary objective of the disposal of surplus commodities in view, go a little slow, and require the various communities to make some showing that there is really a desire for it, and that it will be of benefit. They are doing a splendid work, but the danger is that they might go too fast and cause it to become merely a relief proposition. They think that they should be allowed to proceed as they are now proceeding, and that if we intend to transform it into a relief proposition, we should take the matter up in a relief bill.

Mr. LEE. Did the Senator say that for the current year there was appropriated \$113,000,000 for this service?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I perhaps did not make myself clear. The direct appropriation for the current year is \$113,000,000, and the amount of funds allocated from customs receipts was approximately \$90,000,000. The coming year, due to an increase in customs receipts, there will be approximately \$102,000,000 from that source, as compared with approximately \$90,000,000 for the current year, and a direct appropriation of \$85,000,000, as compared with \$113,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BYRNES. What is the number of cities in which this plan has been inaugurated?

Mr. RUSSELL. Slightly over 50.

Mr. LEE. But the appropriation is slightly under last year's appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, it is a reduction under the current appropriation. But it is large enough to permit considerable expansion of the surplus-removal program by the stamp-plan method.

Mr. LEE. I thought this matter was to be taken up and tried out for a while, and if it were found satisfactory, then it should be extended and expanded. I understood the Senator from South Carolina to say just now that it was his idea that we go slowly. We are certainly going slowly when we are going backward.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not going backward.

Mr. BYRNES. No, we are not going backward.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is proposed to increase the cities having the stamp plan to over a hundred by the 1st of July.

Mr. LEE. But less money is appropriated for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, more money will be available for the stamp plan, because so much of the funds which have been heretofore used for direct purchase of surplus commodities and for the export of those commodities is to be used for that purpose. It is merely a difference in the method of handling it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are two fields of activity, as the Senator has well pointed out. One is the purchase of surplus commodities, and that is a direct benefit to the farmer. Then, on the other side, there is the stamp plan, which is a

direct benefit to the relief worker. I wish to suggest that it is hardly fair to charge this entire appropriation to agriculture, because at least probably half of it, or a very substantial amount of it, should go in the relief bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Because the distribution goes to relieve distress. I think that should be taken into consideration in figuring the amount chargeable to agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had intended to refer to that later on in my remarks.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question in regard to the item on page 75 dealing with the prevention of soil erosion. I note that the committee has raised the amount appropriated by the House by \$1,700,000. Will the Senator state what the understanding was, or what allocation is to be made of the \$1,700,000 in that item?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arkansas will refer to the report of the Senate committee, page 4, he will find that all of that amount is earmarked for cooperation with soil-conservancy districts. The Senator is probably aware of the fact that in the beginning of this fiscal year there were in the neighborhood of 95,000,000 acres embraced within these soil-conservancy districts. Thirty-seven States have now passed laws providing for the formation of these local districts, and for cooperation with the Federal Government in this work, and it is expected that this year there will be over 200,000,000 acres within these soil-conservancy districts. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the appropriation for this activity under the appropriation for the current year by \$1,500,000, in the teeth of this tremendous increase in the service, which had been at least impliedly promised the farmers if they would vote these soil-conservancy districts. The Senate committee restored the appropriation to the amount available for that purpose for the current year, with a slight increase, but nothing like enough to take care of all the soil-conservancy districts which have been formed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas had read the report, and I merely wanted to call the matter to the attention of the Senator from Georgia, to the end, not that I expect it, but that we might not have any diversion of the \$1,700,000 from these two purposes for which the committee and the Congress intend to provide it, because of the importance of the soil-conservation district work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure that the Soil Conservation Service would not break faith with the committee, because the funds are very clearly earmarked for that purpose, and I am sure they will be expended for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Was there a break-down of the \$113,000,000, plus the \$90,000,000, between the expenditures for farm commodities and for export subsidy payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is in the House hearing, and I have referred to it. I do not know whether it appears in the Senate committee hearings or not.

Mr. GEORGE. Was any question raised as to whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture proposed to continue to pay export subsidies on the sale of cotton to foreign buyers?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that that question was raised with specific reference to cotton. I did inquire as to what the plans of the Department were for the coming year with reference to export subsidies on all agricultural commodities. The witness from the Department testified that he did not anticipate any extensive export subsidy program next year, because of the fact that the principal exporters of farm commodities had in many instances left the American market and were acquiring from other sources all the agricultural commodities which had been heretofore exported.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask my colleague another question. So much of the sum as is saved from subsidy pay-

ments on cotton shipped to foreign spinners may be used under the stamp plan, may it not, under the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it may be. The original section 32 and the amendment of last year contained a limitation of 25 percent of the total appropriation as the amount which could be devoted to any one commodity, or expended with respect to any one commodity. The Senate committee amendment this year removed that limitation insofar as the stamp plan is concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. So that all the money the Secretary wants to pay to the foreign purchasers of American cotton by way of subsidy could be paid under the stamp plan?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; not only the amount paid on cotton but the amount that has been paid on exports of wheat, lard, pecans, dates, and other agricultural commodities which have received export subsidies.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield; but I might state to the Senator that I desire to complete my statement at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, and my inquiry will take but a moment. From a reading of the bill it seems the committee did not recommend the appropriation of any funds whatever for the farm-tenancy program, except for the administrative expenses. Is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the Senator from Texas is aware of the fact that when the bill was dealt with in the other body all funds for the farm-tenancy program were eliminated. I stated at the outset of my remarks that later the committee would suggest an amendment in the nature of legislation, which the committee could not, under the rules, attach to the bill, but which would provide for \$50,000,000 for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to carry on the farm-tenancy project for the coming year.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what prompted the inquiry. I had heard some rumors about the R. F. C., but I saw nothing in the bill about the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the Senate rules would prevent the committee recommending legislation in the bill, and I had stated that the amendment would be proposed from the floor. I have already served notice of my intention to move to suspend the rule, if a point of order shall be made against the amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's able statement, but I merely should like to point out at this point that while the committee is to be greatly commended for having provided the sum of \$85,000,000 to augment the funds available under section 32 of the act of 1935, I would not want Senators to get the impression, from listening to the colloquy, that it means a continuation and an augmentation of the stamp plan on the same scale for the coming year; that is, after July 1, 1940, as obtained during the present year, and will be in force down to July 1, 1940. By July 1, 1940, there will be about 100 cities in the country which will have a stamp plan in operation, but even with the sum which the committee has provided it is my understanding that they cannot continue to add cities and communities in anything like the same proportion for the coming year in which they have been adding them and will add them for this year, down to July 1, 1940.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin is correct as to any large increase. As I stated to the Senator from Oklahoma, the sum recommended will prevent the elimination of any cities where the stamp plan has already been adopted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It not only will prevent the elimination of those cities but it will enable the Department to extend the program a little further, though nothing like as far as they have applications now to extend it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to commend the committee for its action, but I expect to debate this question at some greater length in my own time, when I shall not be impinging upon the time of the Senator from Georgia. I intend to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to increase the sum recommended by the committee under section 32 of the act of 1935.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the committee will follow the same procedure with respect to rural electrification as it did with respect to farm tenancy. In other words, an amendment will be offered by the chairman of the committee providing for \$40,000,000 to be loaned from the R. F. C. to the Rural Electrification Board for rural electrification loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Alabama is correct. When I was discussing the total amount contained in this measure in the beginning, I stated that, in all fairness, the Senate should know that these two amendments would be offered from the floor, and I believe the Senate should adopt them, because it is a proper and reasonable way to finance these activities.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Has any Senate committee, other than the Appropriations Committee, considered the matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. Not the change in the method of financing.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It would seem that the Committee on Agriculture should consider the bill, in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, so there might be more policy and planning contained in the measure. In other words, does the able Senator from Georgia feel that our policy toward agriculture has been fully covered in the measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that we have any national program of legislation that is adequate to the needs of agriculture, or to give justice to agriculture. This bill does not undertake to give full justice to agriculture, I will say frankly. But the question raised by the Senator from Minnesota is one that has been brought out on the floor of the Senate numerous times in the past 20 or 25 years. I should prefer not to be diverted into a discussion of what would be the proper committee to handle the bill now. It has been represented several times since I have been a Member of this body that the Committee on Agriculture should handle the bill, and the Committee on Appropriations has with equal zeal sought to keep the bill within the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LUNDEEN. So far as I am concerned I will say that I have no objection to the Committee on Appropriations handling the bill, providing the planning and the policy pursued toward agriculture are fully considered and covered. It would seem to me that the members of the great Agriculture Committee would be more versed and better acquainted with the problems of the American farmer than the very able members of the Appropriations Committee. The Committee on Agriculture is brought into daily contact with all of the problems of farm and forest.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, in making appropriations the Committee on Appropriations can only use the vehicle which has been created by the Committee on Agriculture, through its recommendations. We have no power or authority to institute a Nation-wide farm program. We can make appropriations only pursuant to laws which have received the approval of the Committee on Agriculture, and which have been enacted by the Congress.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It would seem to me that both committees have, up to date, failed to solve this great farm crisis, and I suspect that neither of the two old parties have any real solution for these problems. Certainly both major parties have blundered on from bad to worse year after year. When will Congress, and this great Senate, listen to the well-considered and thoroughly planned farm program of the Farmer Labor Party—a program which was given to the

Nation time after time by Congressman Lindbergh, founder of our party; Floyd Olson, Minnesota's great Governor; and others? I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, one further question before the Senator leaves that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any information before the committee dealing with the types of commodities whose surpluses have been relieved or partially relieved by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation? Is there any information showing how, upon the one hand, those surpluses may have been relieved by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, and yet the same commodity surpluses may have been increased through increased imports due to reduced tariffs upon the same commodities through reciprocal treaties?

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings disclosed a list of all the articles which have been purchased by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. It is my recollection, though I am not certain on the point, that that question was asked, and that no agricultural commodity dealt with in the reciprocal trade agreements had been declared surplus and purchased by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. I will, however, confirm that statement from the committee hearings. I think that issue was raised.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then I have been misadvised, I will say to the Senator. I have been told that 22 farm commodities have suffered great reductions in export as the result of trade treaties, and thus surpluses in those cases have been increased, so that they need to be reduced in turn by payments out of this other branch of the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] asked one of those who appeared before the committee a question along that line, and he elicited the reply that not a single commodity which was dealt with in the trade-agreements program—of course, the Senator realizes I do not wish to be drawn into a discussion of that program, and this is merely a factual statement—that not an article which had been dealt with in that program had been declared surplus and been distributed through the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. It is my recollection that only about 22 articles have been declared surplus during this year for the purposes of this program, so the large number involved in the Senator's statement appears unreasonable.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator's recollection is correct. I do not think that in this list there are 22 surplus products. The list appears on page 848 of the hearings.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I am asking for. May I see the testimony?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say, in connection with the Senator's answer, that I am not altogether certain that the answer was as stated by the Senator, but the question was asked, and perhaps the answer was substantially as the Senator had stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would prefer to refer to the hearings of the committee. I knew the question was asked by the able Senator from Nevada, who was a faithful and efficient member of the subcommittee, and it was my recollection that the witness replied that none of these commodities had been declared surplus.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that beans are being considered in the proposed agreement with Chile.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was referring to trade agreements already actually entered into, not to proposed agreements. I do not think there was any evidence as to proposed agreements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The agreement with Chile is pending, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. If Senators will permit me about 5 minutes to conclude my statement, I shall then be glad to yield to

any question Senators may desire to ask, not promising to answer all of them, but I will attempt to answer them.

As I have stated, the two chief increases that have been proposed by the committee are found in the parity amendments and in the appropriations under section 32 of the act of 1935. A number of smaller increases have been recommended by the Senate committee, most of which had the benefit of Budget estimates, but were refused by the House. There were some other smaller recommendations that were made, bringing up the total amount in the bill to an amount which, though larger than the Budget estimate, and larger than the House appropriation, represents an amount approximately 25 percent below the appropriation for the current year.

The prospect of increasing the debt limitation or of levying new taxes is no more pleasing to me than to anyone else. Both in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor I have consistently voted with those who seek to curtail expenditures in the majority of instances. I submit that when we approach the matter of reducing the National Budget, the reduction should be fairly and equitably prorated between the various activities of Government, and that the agricultural bill of all bills should not be singled out for reductions when we consider the state of the farmer's income as compared with that of practically every other group in this country.

Mr. President, there are thousands of farmers in the United States, many of them good farmers, who produce considerable quantities of the products in which they are engaged in cultivating, whose annual income is not equal to that of those who are employed upon the W. P. A. The farmers as a group are as patriotic as any other class of citizens, but they should not be expected to bear such a large part of the present economy reductions.

As I have pointed out, the reductions in this bill, as compared with the expenditures for the current year, are much greater than in any other bill which has come before Congress. I believe that the farmer would be willing to go forward in a general program of reduction. I know that I wish it were not necessary for the farmers to have to come to the Congress with their hats in their hand every year begging for some little appropriations to supplement their already meager income. Congress should enact some definite program which would avoid the necessity of the farmer having to gamble from year to year what the Congress is going to do in the matter of farm appropriations. Certainly anyone who is familiar with the situation in the homes and in the life on the farms of the United States will know that this group should not be singled out as the sole victims of an economy drive which leaves untouched the appropriations for the other activities of Government.

Some of the great metropolitan papers have been most severe in their editorial criticism of the committee for exceeding the Budget estimate in this bill. I am not at all sensitive to such criticism, Mr. President. My career has immunized me to any pains or grief from criticism of that sort. My sensitiveness has been done away with long ago. But I wish to say to those in the Senate or out of it, who must pass upon this measure, who are disturbed by these editorial criticisms, that none of these editorials which have come to my attention have been fair enough to point out that in the first instance the Bureau of the Budget imposed upon the farm bill a disproportionate part of the total overall deduction in the Budget for the coming year.

These editorials refer to the parity-payments appropriation as though it were some venal and meretricious effort to purchase the farm vote on the part of the Congress. They did not state that appropriations for parity were made in 1938 and 1939 and that as compared with the appropriations of the year 1939 the current bill appropriates less money for these payments; that the committee has reduced the appropriation instead of increasing it.

I wonder what some of these editorial writers would have said if someone had come along and made a 40-percent reduction in their compensation, as was made in this bill. They

would have howled to heaven much louder than the cries we have heard from the farmers.

I might say further that almost without any exception those who are critical of this bill providing funds for loans to enable tenant farmers to become home owners, have urged that unlimited loans to foreign countries be made from the Federal Treasury. Some of those newspapers have demanded additional facilities to enable the air lines to secure weather reports. And yet they criticize this bill in which we have been compelled to double, yea treble, in the past few years the appropriations for the Weather Bureau in order to give the services they have demanded. Some of them have highly commended the so-called stamp plan for the distribution of agricultural surpluses to those on relief. They have demanded its expansion throughout the country. Yet they have not withheld their criticism of the appropriation which makes this plan possible.

As I have stated heretofore, the communities in which these newspapers are situated have derived from this bill the surplus commodities to those who are on relief. It is a refreshing thing that the Senate does not have any monopoly on inconsistency, Mr. President. I am sure that no Member of this body will be deterred from offering the half-handed justice to the farmers of America provided in this bill, by the comments of some editorial writer who probably would not know a Jimson weed from a cornstalk.

If the income of the American farmer is still further reduced, it will not be long till the effect will be felt by those in the cities as well as those on the farm. There can be no sustained prosperity in this country if the farmer has absolutely no purchasing power. Until the time that legislation can be enacted fixing the prices of farm commodities as we have artificially fixed the price of practically every other thing produced in this country, this bill is the best that the Committee on Appropriations could present to the Senate.

The bill is not going to be wholly pleasing to everyone. It is not pleasing to me, because it does not go as far as I should like it to go, but it does go as far as I think it is possible to go at this session of Congress. It is not going to please the farmer, because he has had promises of full parity for a great many years. It will not be pleasing to those who regard the Budget as sacred, and who say that no amendment should change the Budget estimates in the slightest degree.

It will not please those who are demanding that the stamp plan be extended to all the cities. But, Mr. President, it is a compromise, as most involved legislation is a compromise. It is an honest attempt on the part of the committee, which gave long and earnest consideration to the bill, to deal as fairly as possible with the most underprivileged group in the country, the lowest income group in the Nation, at the same time bearing in mind the condition of the National Treasury and the amount available for this purpose, and being fully conscious of the limitations on the committee in recommending legislation which I, for one, think should be adopted to fix the price of farm commodities in this country.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel that I should first yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Bilbo]. He kindly deferred a question a moment ago.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator what assurance he has that the money received under section 32 of the act of 1935 as import subsidies for the benefit of the farmers will not be used for paying subsidies on exportation of farm products.

Mr. RUSSELL. The evidence before the committee developed the fact that with respect to some export commodities, without regard to the amount of subsidy paid, it was not possible to find a buyer. England and France, who have purchased large quantities of such commodities in the past, have placed an absolute embargo on their importation from the United States into those countries. They are saving all their dollars for airplanes and war material and buying everything they can from the colonies or the nations adjacent to Germany and not affected by the naval blockade.

Mr. BILBO. Is it upon those statements that the Senator predicates his hope that we shall have more money to be used in the extension of the stamp-plan program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that present indications, as developed before the committee, were that there would be more money for the surplus distribution program in this country than there had been even under the larger appropriation. However, the fact that such commodities cannot be exported will, of course, increase the need for their distribution in this country in a surplus-removal program at home.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator says that he has not available the amount of the fund which was utilized during the past year in paying export subsidies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Page 848 of the House hearings on the bill contains a full statement of the amount expended for purchase for distribution within the United States, as well as the amount paid for export subsidies on each and every commodity.

Mr. BILBO. On every commodity?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. The amount may not be more than 25 percent on any one commodity. I believe that is the law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the limitation in the law.

Mr. BILBO. This is what I really wanted to ask the Senator: Would the Senator have any objection to an amendment prohibiting the use of any of this fund for export subsidies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not feel authorized to accept such an amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Such an amendment would make safe the extension of the stamp-plan program. It is only guesswork as it is.

Mr. RUSSELL. My conclusion is predicated on world conditions today.

The Senator from Mississippi well knows—because I have heard him refer to the fact on the floor—that embargoes have been levied by some of the countries on agricultural exports from this Nation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator one final question. Let me say to him that I am not one of those who consider the Budget sacred; but this happens to be a year when, unless we cling with some degree of scruple to the Budget, we shall find ourselves colliding with the statutory debt limit in respect to the national debt. It is my understanding that the President's financial program—which means, of course, staying within the Budget—brings us within \$61,000,000 of the statutory limit on the national debt, provided we also raise about \$400,000,000 in additional taxes. Without arguing the merits of clinging to the Budget as it is, if clinging to the Budget brings us within \$61,000,000 of the statutory limit upon the national debt, and if the bill exceeds the Budget limit by \$201,000,000, do we not by passing the bill put ourselves in a position in which we must choose between increasing the statutory debt limit and raising additional taxes? What is the Senator's comment upon that situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I could not give anything but my own views on that matter; and my opinion is probably no better than that of other Members of the Senate.

In the first place, I have predicated my support of these amendments on the fact that the reductions of the Bureau of the Budget in current appropriations were disproportionate. I have voted for all amendments to reduce other bills which have passed the Congress. The Senator from Michigan and other Senators who are disturbed by the very question which the Senator has just raised have already voted their approval of general appropriation bills carrying increased appropriations for other agencies of Government, and have not raised the question as to where the money was coming from until the farm bill was reached.

I have made the statement that any parity payment would not be expended until the fall of 1941. I made that statement, of course, to seek to elicit support for the amendment, and not because I am willing to accept the view that the

farm program and the farm appropriations should be singled out as the only activity of government for which special taxes should be definitely levied and earmarked. I am willing to support additional taxes to go into the Treasury of the United States, but I am not willing to go before the farmers of the United States, the lowest income group in this country, and say, "We cannot appropriate funds for you because we could not pass a special tax to accompany your appropriation bill," when that procedure is not required in connection with any other appropriation bill. Who tells any agency or bureau which has an appropriation in the independent offices bill that, "You shall not be allowed this increase in your appropriation over the current appropriation until some special tax is levied"? Who tells the Department of the Interior, when a large project or a great expenditure involved in that bill is presented to the Congress, that no appropriation shall be made for the Department of the Interior until a specific and special tax is levied for the benefit of the project? The President has suggested that taxes should be levied to defray the unusual outlays made by the War Department and by the Navy Department for national defense; and I, for one, am willing to support such taxes. But until this year who had ever said to the War Department, to the Navy Department, or to any other department, "You need an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000, which we are compelled to reduce to \$500,000,000 because we have not levied any special taxes for your Department"?

So far as I am advised, that question has never been raised until this year in dealing with any bill taking money from the Treasury, except when we seek farm appropriations and parity payments to give the farmers a part of what we promised them, or what we gave them reason to believe they should have back in 1938, when the farm bill was enacted. This year it was mentioned in connection with unusual appropriations for national defense.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator has misconstrued the purpose of my inquiry. I am not seeking to quarrel with his thesis that the agricultural appropriation bill has had an undue share of economy thrust upon it by the Budget Bureau. I am not controverting that statement at all; and I am not arguing the merits of the appropriations to which the Senator refers. I am merely asking him about the fiscal situation. If we exceed the Budget by \$201,000,000 do we not create a situation in which the appropriation is not worth anything unless we increase the revenue or increase the debt limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think so, because the Senator from Michigan knows that nobody is talking seriously about raising any \$460,000,000 in taxes at this session of Congress. I for one am willing to vote for them. I have always commended the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] because the Senator from Wisconsin, while a liberal spender, is also willing to impose taxes with which to finance expenditures. However, the Senator knows that \$460,000,000 of additional taxes will not be levied. They have not yet been levied, and no bill is being seriously considered for that purpose. So, even if we slash the heart out of the farm appropriation and go back to the Budget estimate, which we have exceeded by some \$200,000,000, we shall still violate the \$45,000,000,000 debt limitation, and this bill will not be the cause of it at all. The \$45,000,000,000 limitation will be touched because the Congress is not following the President's recommendation that we levy \$460,000,000 of taxes; and the \$460,000,000 of new revenue is inextricably interwoven with the Bureau's total over-all recommendation, to avoid violating the \$45,000,000,000 debt limit. The Senator from Michigan is aware of that fact. If we were to appropriate exactly the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, even cutting the heart out of the farm program, if the Senator's figures and premise be correct, we should still violate the \$45,000,000,000 debt limitation unless reductions were made in other bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct, provided the increased taxes are not voted.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as I am concerned, I take the position that I shall vote for any increased taxes necessary to finance this year's appropriations rather than increase the debt limit.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the same view.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perfectly willing to proceed on that theory. However, the fact that no new tax bill has yet been presented does not relieve me from asking myself what happens when \$201,000,000 is added to the appropriations for this year, bringing us—

Mr. RUSSELL. No; \$201,000,000 is not added to the appropriations for this year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry; \$201,000,000 above the Budget estimate, bringing us at least \$150,000,000 across the line of the debt limit. All I am trying to find out is whether or not, if I vote for \$201,000,000 beyond the Budget figure at this point, I have morally obligated myself to do one of two things: Either to vote to increase the debt limit or to vote for increased taxes in order to balance the account, unless we can find some other place to effect economies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. I wish to point out to the Senator from Michigan, who says he does not regard the Budget as being a sacred thing which cannot be touched by the hands of the Congress, that the Senator from Michigan has seen the independent offices bill pass the Congress; he has seen the Treasury-Post Office bill pass the Congress; and he has seen the emergency supplemental appropriation bill—which is really a bill augmenting the Army and Navy expenditures—pass the Congress, without raising the question of the Budget.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Were they not all under the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the Budget, but not under the current year's appropriation. So the Senator is taking the Budget as his standard and following it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am taking the Budget as my standard for the calculation about which I am speaking.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and the Senator has taken the Budget as his standard for the other bills to which I refer. The question was not raised when those bills passed, some of them containing appropriations for the departments which were substantially in excess of the appropriation for the current year. Those bills were passed without any question being raised in the Congress. The question of comparison with last year's appropriations is not raised until the agricultural appropriation bill comes along, and then the Senator says it is \$201,000,000 over the Budget estimate. Of course, it is \$201,000,000 over the Budget estimate, but it is substantially under the appropriations for the current year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We have to remake the Budget unless we are to follow it with some degree of consistency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am undertaking to remake the Budget so far as this bill is concerned, and I have no apologies to make therefor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not ask the Senator to apologize.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill was subjected to more drastic reductions by the Budget Bureau than any other bill. I do not think the reductions are justified.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will say to the Senator that I completely follow him in respect to the Surplus Commodity Corporation program, because I think it is very excellent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator also favor parity for the American farmer?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I favor parity for the American farmer in some such—

Mr. RUSSELL. How are we going to give it to him if we do not appropriate for it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment, until I answer the question. I favor parity for the American farmer in some such natural process as in my judgment can be followed along the lines of some plan similar to the one which the able Senator from Oklahoma has been discussing, and which I have been discussing for many years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I commend the Senator's good judgment. He approves the plan of the Senator from Oklahoma. I supported that plan on the floor, by voice and vote, when it was defeated in the Senate. I am still for price fixing on the domestic allotment basis.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us not get off the track. I do not want to be put in the position, and I do not think it is fair that the Senator should do it, that I am raising this question on the agricultural bill in some spirit that is unfriendly to the farming appropriations. I am simply trying to find out whether I do not obligate myself to vote either for new taxes or for an increased debt limit if this expenditure should go outside the President's financial program.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the figures contained in the Budget are correct, frankness demands that I should answer "yes," with the other exception mentioned by the Senator a few minutes ago—unless a reduction is made in other appropriation bills which have not yet come before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I should first yield to the Senator from Tennessee. Then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely want to say that there is another contingency in which we would not have to cut down this appropriation. I understand from very high authority that the receipts from the internal revenue department of the Government are about \$100,000,000 ahead of last year; and that will help to some extent, at any rate, in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that increase will be even more marked.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand it is \$100,000,000 up to this good hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish further to say that my statement was not intended to embarrass the Senator from Michigan; but I must express the candid opinion that the Senator from Michigan has fallen into the ways of most of the metropolitan dailies and a great many Members of Congress who feel bound by the Budget estimates in specific bills and on specific items, or who use that as their standard, rather than taking the over-all Budget and then making a comparative analysis of the reductions which have been made in the current appropriations, as well as considering the desirability and the relative merits of the appropriations for the various activities of the Government.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is it not true that there is still another alternative beyond the one suggested by the Senator from Tennessee and the two alternatives suggested by the Senator from Michigan?

The Senator from Michigan suggested that if we exceeded the Budget by this bill or other bills, it would be necessary either to raise the debt limit or to raise new money by taxation. The Senator from Tennessee very properly suggests that the revenue may run \$100,000,000 above the estimates. I happened to see in a newspaper today that the returns in one district in my State indicate an increase above the estimates of \$800,000 in that one district alone.

There is still another possibility for avoiding the two contingencies suggested by the Senator from Michigan. The Treasury Department has on hand a balance of \$1,622,000,000, which is very much in excess of the balance which has customarily been carried on hand in the past, and which is being carried for no discernible or apparent reason except that some of the officials of the Treasury Department like to have a large sum of money on hand. Is it not possible, if Congress should pass this appropriation bill and other appropriation bills in amounts exceeding the Budget, that the Government might dip into that \$1,622,000,000 of working balance for which the Treasury Department has no particular use?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think some funds might be derived from that source. I never have been able to see any reason for keeping such a large working balance.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BYRNES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. McKELLAR. One other thing, Mr. President: The military and naval bills are both yet to come before the Senate. While I am very strong for national defense, I think it would be a more just proposal to defer to some extent our military appropriations and preparations than to do away with these matters which have already been promised to the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, undoubtedly these items have as definite a national-defense value as building battle-ships or buying guns.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, of course. They ought to have precedence.

Mr. RUSSELL. How can we expect to maintain our institutions of government in this country when those who are by nature most devoted to their Government, and who are inherently conservative—those who live on the farms—are being forced to travel along at 68 percent of parity income for that which they produce through long hours of toil? The farmer helps finance but is not the beneficiary of the social-security program; he is not assisted by the wage-hour legislation; he is not protected by high tariffs, but pays for the protection of others. The farmers are subject to every hazard of insect and weather to which man can be subjected, without security or guaranty, yet we come here and take time in debating whether we will hand out this meager appropriation of \$212,000,000, which will not even bring the farmer up to 75 percent of parity, unless there is some substantial increase in farm prices before the coming year.

Certainly, this is as important an item of national defense as the Congress could possibly enact into law, because it is touched with justice, in addition to being calculated to give those who live on the farm the feeling that they have a Nation worth defending, and to give them strong bodies and willing hands to undertake that defense in case of national emergency.

Mr. McKELLAR. And if we should have a war, we should be pressing them to bring forward the greatest production ever had.

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in connection with what was suggested by the Senator from Missouri that we might consider the fact that we have a Treasury balance of \$1,620,000,000, for the comfort of the Senator from Michigan, I call his attention to the further fact that during the closing days of the Republican administration it was deemed sufficient by the great Secretary of the Treasury before the greatest next to Alexander Hamilton—Secretary Ogden Mills—to have a Treasury balance on March 1, 1933, of \$204,000,000, which went down on March 3 to \$151,000,000. If it was safe to have a Treasury balance of only \$150,000,000 during the Republican administration, the country might feel that it is reasonably safe when we have at this time a balance of \$1,620,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I promised to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE]. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I was not going to speak on that particular point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think the Senator from South Carolina and all of us will agree that the amount of balance in the Treasury on March 3, 1933, was entirely too small.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We were lucky to have any.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we have to keep another fact in mind. Assuming that \$1,620,000,000 is too much, I think it is probably safe to say that the balance ought to be kept within the neighborhood of a billion dollars, for the reason

that when the Government is constantly selling its obligations, those with money to buy those obligations look to see whether, when they come due, the Government probably will be in a position to pay them; otherwise, they might have to renew them, and so forth. I think it does have some psychological effect upon the purchasers of Government obligations to know that the financial situation of the Treasury is sufficient to justify them in believing that the obligations will be met.

Mr. BYRNES. I agree. As a matter of fact, I have given a little study to the subject. I mentioned it only because it was mentioned by the Senator from Missouri. To be entirely fair, I should say that at this time there are demands upon the Treasury in excess of those which then existed—demands because of unemployment compensation. I have taken the trouble to find out the amount of money paid during this fiscal year for those purposes, which did not exist at that time. The total amount does not exceed \$300,000,000. So, taking into consideration the demands for purposes which were not in contemplation at that time, \$300,000,000 plus \$150,000,000 is only \$450,000,000.

We have \$1,620,000,000. Of course, we could permit the balance to go down too low. No one would say that we ought to permit it to go down to the balance which was maintained in the closing days of the Hoover administration; but, at the same time, even having in mind the bank situation, I do not believe it is necessary to maintain a balance of \$1,620,000,000. Certainly, when we discuss levying additional taxes, I do not think it necessary. If confronted with the alternative of levying \$300,000,000 of additional taxes because of the program submitted by the President, or reducing the bank balance from \$1,600,000,000 to \$1,300,000,000, I certainly would have no hesitation. I think we could, without any fear of impairing the Government credit, administer the Government with \$1,250,000,000, or \$1,000,000,000, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, and either one of those sums would enable us to get by without much of the worry the Senator from Michigan expressed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not for a moment contend that it is necessary to maintain a balance of \$1,600,000,000. Of course, the balance fluctuates. It is not always \$1,600,000,000. It goes up and down, although I do not think it has been less than \$1,000,000,000 for any length of time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was \$1,500,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEE. What percentage of parity will the \$212,000,000 provided in the bill pay at the present farm prices?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I stated, for the present year, including the parity payments, it averages around 68 percent of parity the farmer would receive under the \$225,000,000 appropriation. Farm prices are a bit higher than they were when those figures were compiled; \$212,000,000, if prices remain at the present level, should furnish the producers of the basic commodities somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 percent of parity.

Mr. LEE. There is a jump in the Senator's statement which I do not follow. Does the Senator mean that since the figures were made farm prices have risen enough to spread the difference between 63 percent of parity and 75 percent of parity?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not as to all commodities, but it is true as to wheat. Wheat is much higher than it was when the average farm prices were established. Cotton is somewhat higher. I do not like to express an opinion, but I will venture to state that unless there is some further increase in the prices of the five basic commodities, the farm prices, together with the parity payments which may be made under the appropriations made in the pending bill, will not bring the farmer 75 percent of parity.

Mr. LEE. I wanted that shown in the RECORD. I appreciate the Senator's frankness. I do not want the impression to go abroad to farmers that we are voting them 75 percent

of parity when, as a matter of fact, we are depending on the hope that the farm prices will rise. Of course, we hope they will, but as of the day when we are taking up this appropriation bill, even if we appropriate all the Senator and his committee ask for, at best it will figure around 68 to, perhaps, 70 percent of parity. Is that about correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think it would be slightly above 70.

Mr. LEE. With respect to wheat, but not as to cotton.

Mr. RUSSELL. With respect to wheat, and it will be, of course, a sheer estimate, but I think it will lack two or three points of being 75 percent as to cotton.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire also to have printed in the RECORD, following the table I have already offered as to parity prices and today's farm prices, a table which shows the effect of the Congress failing to make the parity appropriation for next year.

I call the attention of Senators from wheat States to the fact that if no appropriations are made for parity payments, the total payments from the Federal Government to the wheat farmers will be reduced from 19 cents a bushel to 9 cents a bushel, a reduction of about 50 percent. In the case of corn the payments will be reduced from a total of 15 cents a bushel to 10 cents a bushel, and in the case of cotton they will be reduced from 3.15 cents a pound to 1.6 cents a pound, if no appropriations are made for parity payments. In other words, as to cotton and wheat the farmers producing those commodities will find their Government payments reduced next year by 50 percent, cut in two, and in the case of corn the payments will be reduced approximately to two-thirds of the present rate of payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the printing of the table presented by the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE E.—Rates of payments to Agricultural Adjustment Administration cooperators on normal yields of their acreage allotments

Commodity	1939			1940			1941 ¹	
	Conservation	Parity	Total	Conservation	Parity	Total	Conservation	Total
Cotton, cents per pound.....	1.8	1.6	3.4	1.6	1.55	3.15	1.6	1.6
Corn, cents per bushel.....	9.0	6.0	15.0	10.0	5.00	15.00	10.0	10.0
Wheat, cents per bushel.....	17.0	11.0	28.0	9.0	10.00	19.00	9.0	9.0

¹ On basis of 1940 conservation payment rates. Rates for 1941 not yet determined. Assumes no parity payments in 1941.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice of my intention to move a suspension of the rules, which I desire to file at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the notice read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 8202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz, on page 80, line 8, insert the following:

"Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1938 and 1939 carried out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who complied with the terms and conditions of the 1938 and 1939 agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. BYRNES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8202, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed. (For text of amendment referred to see the foregoing notice.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, our hearts go out to Thee in gratitude for all the strong, self-sacrificing men whom Thou hast raised up in every age to be the bearers of truth and justice. By the heavens above and the earth beneath, by the faith which has come down to us through the ages, by the eternal hope that shines brighter than the sun, by the love which neither time nor space can sever, by the still small voice, O bid us go forward to quit ourselves like men in the great battle of life. Let Thy kingdom come in all our hearts that we may mediate pure thoughts and speak words of wisdom. Charity thinketh no evil; a soft answer turneth away wrath; a good deed touches the hearts of men; behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. O stars of God, shine over the earth, over the seas, and over our broad land for a million years and a day, and ever lead us to the coveted goal of peace and brotherhood. Continue to bless our most honorable Speaker with growing health and strength; direct the Congress in the paths of wisdom and discretion. So guide our President and his advisers that our Nation may continue to be an inspiration in this old world for righteousness and justice; in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8068) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title: H. R. 4868. An act to amend the act authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) entitled "An act for the relief of Roland Hanson, a minor; and Dr. E. A. Julien," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5982) entitled "An act for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress and providing penalties for the violation thereof," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. VAN NUYS, and Mr. DANAHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8641) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

BELLE G. SCHMOYER

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 429

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Belle G. Schmoyer, widow of Harry A. Schmoyer, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation, and an additional sum not to exceed \$250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Harry A. Schmoyer.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH and Mr. HOUSTON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes treaty from the Gaelic American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received from the president of the American Medical Association which has reference to the campaign against venereal diseases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered Friday before the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered before the Economic Club of New York by E. T. Weir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have been making an investigation in reference to the Work Projects

Administration, and I am very sorry to say that between now and July 1, 800,000 W. P. A. workers will be separated from their jobs unless Congress makes an additional appropriation. At the present time W. P. A. is carrying a load of 2,300,000 people, but the appropriation available between now and the end of the fiscal year will require a reduction to 1,500,000.

We are going to be confronted with another reduction unless the Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1941 is increased. Under that estimate only 1,350,000 people can be taken care of from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. This situation, if the Congress appropriates the entire amount recommended by the Budget, means approximately 500,000 W. P. A. workers will be dropped between July 1, 1940, and November 1, 1940. In other words, almost 1,500,000 less people will be on the W. P. A. rolls in November 1940 than are on the rolls at the present time. No increase in private employment warrants such a drastic reduction. Over 700,000 employees were released by W. P. A. during July and August 1939, and the great majority of those are appealing for reinstatement, saying that it has been absolutely impossible for them to secure work with private industry. One-fourth of the unemployed, based upon the general figures of 1936 to 1939, were employed by W. P. A., but during the next fiscal year only 16 percent of the unemployed will be taken care of by W. P. A., based upon an average of 9,000,000 people out of employment. What information is coming to us now indicates that there has been a falling off in production, as a result of which unemployment has increased since the 1st of last December. Over 6,000,000 people above the number out of work in 1929 are now looking for employment, and, with a reduction in W. P. A. during the next fiscal year, this will be increased to well over 7,000,000 people. We are still hopeful that private employment will show an increase, but surely we cannot expect such a tremendous number of our citizens to be taken care of within so limited a time. Suppose that business does expand as we hope, should the war end there immediately would be a drop in exports. It seems to me, whether we like it or not, we must increase the appropriation for W. P. A. over and above that recommended by the Budget. The financial condition of the States, taking them as a whole, is such that they will not be able to grant direct relief to the unemployed. It is my opinion that we should provide funds to take care of a million more people than the Budget figure for the fiscal year 1941 will permit; in other words, it is the duty of this Government to take care of not less than 2,350,000 people, which will be only 25 percent of the unemployed.

Reducing the number of those on W. P. A. will certainly be reflected in purchasing power. You cannot take away the income, no matter how small it might be, of so many of our citizens without consumption being greatly reduced. This undoubtedly will result in lowering production, followed by an increase in the number of unemployed.

The time to face this issue is now. While I have consistently supported the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, I refuse to remain silent knowing the situation which will confront us in the very near future.

The exact picture confronting the unemployed in this country should be brought out by the Appropriations Committee of the House when it considers relief legislation. Those hearings will start this week, but officials of the W. P. A. will not be called until a later date. A thorough investigation should be made by the Administrator so he can inform Congress of the exact situation that will confront his organization. He should present all the facts and show the critical situation that is going to develop.

No one regrets more than I do the necessity of calling this to the attention of the Congress and the country, because I was in hopes that there would be an increase in business that would not only reduce the number of unemployed in this country but would also enable the Government to reduce expenses.

There is an interesting discussion among columnists as to the number of unemployed in this country. This developed

from an article written by Miss Dorothy Thompson, who makes a statement which we all would like to say is true—that only 2,000,000 people are unemployed in the United States at the present time. Miss Thompson's figures are in direct contrast to all figures that have been issued by the Government, as well as labor organizations. Considering the figures of all, with the exception of Miss Thompson's, 9,000,000 unemployed would seem to be more correct. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects: First, on the subject of distribution of the farmers' products; second, on J. Edgar Hoover; and third, on the subject of other people's money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution adopted by the New York State Waterways Association on October 20, 1939, in reference to S. 2009.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments appearing in the press with reference to the sale of aircraft to the allied governments by domestic manufacturers and its relation to the Navy aviation procurement program, I took the matter up with the Bureau of Aeronautics and am advised in a letter from the Secretary of the Navy that the sales to the allied governments have resulted in earlier deliveries to the Navy Department; that there is no evidence that the cost of aircraft to the Navy Department has been enhanced by the sale of such equipment to the allied governments, but there is evidence that the cost has been reduced.

In the case of one particular contract there was a reduction of approximately \$575,000 to the Navy Department due to the manufacturer's reduction of the overhead ratio on account of the greatly enhanced volume of business due to export orders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by incorporating a letter from the Secretary of the Navy on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 18, 1940.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Naval Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: In response to your inquiry, you are advised that the sale of aircraft to the Allied governments by domestic manufacturers has not interfered with the Navy Department's aircraft procurement program. In at least one instance sales of this nature resulted in earlier deliveries to the Navy Department. The contractor had built up a large and efficient force and manufactured the Navy Department's order at a very high rate. Except for prior sales to the Allied governments, this large force would not have been assembled. Except for the availability of subsequent orders for the Allied governments, the contractor would have been constrained greatly to reduce this force and extend his work for the Navy Department over a greater period.

Another manufacturer, in connection with a sale to the Government of Finland, offered to effect great improvements in certain of the Department's airplanes if the Department would accept a stipulated extension of delivery dates under the contract. The extended date was such as to meet the Navy's replacement program, and the improvements offered were precisely those previously under discussion between the contractor and the Department. Had the

sale to Finland not eventuated, the Navy Department could have accomplished the same betterment of its equipment only at the cost of greater over-all delay and of a greatly enhanced expenditure of funds.

I have no evidence that the cost of aircraft to the Navy Department has been enhanced by sales of such equipment to the Allied governments. There is evidence that the cost has been reduced. For instance, in the case of one particular contract, there was a reduction of approximately \$575,000 in cost to the Department due to the manufacturer's reduction of the overhead ratio on account of his greatly enhanced volume of business due to export orders.

The enlarged volume of aircraft manufacture for export account is of inestimable value to our country economically and from the standpoint of national defense. Upon it is based, directly and indirectly, the employment of working forces enlarged by many thousands. These additional employees are, in a short period, trained in a useful trade, with benefit to themselves and the Nation throughout their industrial lives. Administrative, engineering, and supervisory forces are not only enlarged but are trained and experienced in the organization and control of their industry operating on a large scale not otherwise attainable. The enlarged volume of business furnishes the means and the incentive upon which the industry can base a more extensive development program. Enlarged plant facilities will assure the execution of any future program for our own country. The inefficiencies to be anticipated are minor and fleeting, the benefits may be expected to endure for at least a generation.

I trust the above information is fully responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different topics, in the first extension to include a statement by M. J. Robinson concerning a bill I have introduced in the House, and in the other extension to include a statement by George R. Hay, of Patagonia, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing this morning in the Washington Times-Herald by Willard Edwards entitled "Senator WAGNER Joins Demands for Drastic Shake-up in the N. L. R. B."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation from the Washington Post and from the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. We cannot hear these requests. We cannot hear a word that is being said.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire that the gentleman from Montana should repeat his request?

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to know what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THORKELOSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short quotation from the Washington Post and from the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. What part of the Washington Post? It is not that venal voice of Babson on the utilities side?

Mr. THORKELOSON. No; no utilities.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorandum relative to the trade-treaty program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter received by me this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE CRAZY GAME OF BLIND-MAN'S BUFF

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when a businessman makes money, the Federal Government takes a great part of it in taxes. When many large corporations or railroads lose money and go broke, they borrow from some Federal lending agency and keep going.

When a businessman goes broke, his assets are usually sold under the hammer for the benefit of his creditors. When a farmer goes broke trying to make money out of the soil, he is run off the farm and onto the city relief rolls. When a workingman in the city goes broke and is unable to find employment so that he can feed and house his family, he is kicked around like a vagrant—on the relief rolls today and off tomorrow.

But when the Federal Government goes broke, they just exchange I O U's with the money changers, and the crazy game of blind-man's buff goes on. Meanwhile the Nation totters on the brink of despair. Forty-four billion debt and running in the red ten thousand a minute—where will you get the money?

However, let no one say that this is a Nation with an uncharitable soul. Even if our own people are in want, we still have millions to give away and loan to those who suffer and are oppressed in other lands.

And our own 8,000,000 refugees are still waiting for the New Deal to make good its promises of 1932. Do it, and in the name of freedom save the Nation. [Applause.]

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the national debt, I have heard what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has had to say from day to day in regard to it. The gentleman wants the national debt paid. Naturally, we would all like to pay our individual debts as quickly as possible, and would like to pay the national debt owed by the Federal Government; but let us compare our national debt with that of other major countries of the world and consider what would happen if all debts were paid.

Recently I asked the Department of Commerce to furnish me the best information available regarding the national wealth of the major countries in the world and the debts owed by these countries. Germany was not included in the request, because Germany repudiated her debts a few years ago, and naturally her debts would be low and would not be a fair comparison. The information with reference to the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy, which was furnished to me as the best information available for the years indicated, is as follows:

United States, \$247,300,000,000 (1932), per capita, \$1,950; United Kingdom, \$87,815,000,000 (1928 at \$4.86), per capita, \$1,901; France, \$43,120,000,000 (1931 at \$0.039), per capita, \$1,031

	Per capita		Percent	
	Debt	Wealth	Debt to wealth	Debt to income
United States	\$317	\$1,950	16.2	57
United Kingdom	807	1,901	41.4	149
France	254	1,031	24.6	124
Italy	206	555	32.0	169

It will be noticed that the estimate of national wealth for the United Kingdom is based upon the year 1928, when times were good and the estimate of wealth was higher than subsequent years. Whereas the estimate for the United States is based upon 1932 figures and is much lower than it would be today. Notwithstanding this unfavorable comparison by using a good year for England and a bad year for the United States, it will be noticed that if our debt were as large in proportion to wealth as the debt of the United Kingdom, it would be \$104,000,000,000 instead of \$44,000,000,000 as it is today. In fact, if we were to use present-day estimates, the wealth would be over \$3,000 per capita in the United States, and based upon a \$3,000 per capita wealth in this country and a \$2,000 per capita wealth in the United Kingdom, our national debt would be approximately \$160,000,000,000 if it were as large in proportion as the national debt of the United Kingdom.

Using the same basis for computing what our national debt would be if as large, according to wealth per capita, as the national debt of France, our national debt would be over \$70,000,000,000 instead of \$44,000,000,000 as it is today. If the actual wealth as of 1940 is used instead of the low estimate for 1932, our national debt would be over \$100,000,000,000, if it were as large in proportion as the debt of France.

If our debt were as large as the debt of Italy, it would be over \$90,000,000,000 instead of \$44,000,000,000 as it is now, and if we used present-day estimates for 1940 instead of 1932 our national debt would have to be \$130,000,000,000 before it would be equal to the national debt of Italy.

I am inserting herewith a table which was furnished by the Department of Commerce from the source indicated:

National income per capita (1937, except as noted)

Country	National income	Population	Per capita income
United States	\$71,853,000,000	129,257,000	\$556
United Kingdom	25,709,000,000	47,400,000	542
Germany (excluding Austria)	28,531,000,000	67,687,000	422
France	8,578,000,000	41,905,000	205
Australia	3,050,000,000	6,867,000	444
New Zealand	786,000,000	1,574,000	499
Sweden (1936)	2,191,000,000	6,285,000	349
Switzerland (1934)	2,104,000,000	4,120,000	511
Belgium	2,235,000,000	5,361,000	267
Canada	4,576,000,000	11,129,000	412
Denmark (1936)	928,000,000	3,715,000	250
Estonia (1936)	86,000,000	1,130,000	76
Finland (1936)	458,000,000	3,835,000	93
Hungary	875,000,000	9,035,000	97
Ireland (1935)	731,000,000	2,966,000	246
Italy	5,260,000,000	43,000,000	122
Japan (1936)	3,776,000,000	71,253,000	53
Netherlands	2,477,000,000	8,635,000	287
Norway	655,000,000	2,907,000	225
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	19,140,000,000	175,000,000	109
Yugoslavia	1,017,000,000	15,400,000	66

Based on data in League of Nations' World Economic Survey 1938-39, p. 84.

It will be noticed that the United States has the largest per capita income of any country and the largest national income of any country. The per capita income in the United States is more than two and one-half times as much as it is in France, yet the French debt in proportion is twice as large as our national debt. Our per capita income is more than four times as much as it is in Italy, yet the national debt of Italy is from two to three times as much in proportion as our national debt. The following table is self-explanatory:

Statistics of national debts

Country	Population, end of 1937 (millions)	Date	Total debt in local currency (millions)	Total debt in millions of dollars	Per capita debt in dollars
Argentina	12.8	Dec. 31, 1937	4,033 pesos	1,343	105
Australia	6.9	June 30, 1938	1,275 pounds	5,037	730
Austria	6.8	Dec. 31, 1937	3,482 schillings	657	97
Belgium	8.4	do	55,762 francs	1,784	212
Brazil	43.2	do	16,571 pesos	903	21
Bulgaria	6.3	Dec. 31, 1938	21,779 leva	298	43
Canada	11.2	Mar. 31, 1938	3,540 dollars	3,540	316
Chile	4.6	Dec. 31, 1938	3,840 pesos	197	43
Denmark	3.8	Mar. 31, 1938	1,255 kroner	279	73
Finland	3.6	Dec. 31, 1937	4,302 markkaa	95	26
France	42.0	do	314,284 francs	10,654	254

Statistics of national debts—Continued

Country	Population, end of 1937 (millions)	Date	Total debt in local currency (millions)	Total debt in millions of dollars	Per capita debt in dollars
Germany	68.3	Dec. 31, 1938	27,241 reichsmarks	10,923	160
Greece	7.0	Mar. 31, 1937	49,680 drachmas	445	64
India	362.0	Mar. 31, 1939	12,056 rupees	4,226	12
Italy	43.0	Sept. 30, 1935	108,637 lire	8,843	206
Japan	71.5	Mar. 31, 1938	13,270 yen	3,832	54
Mexico	19.3	Dec. 31, 1936	1,326 pesos	340	18
Netherlands	8.6	Dec. 31, 1937	4,066 guilders	2,261	263
Norway	2.9	June 30, 1938	1,496 kroner	373	129
Poland	34.5	Sept. 30, 1938	4,973 zloty	936	27
Rumania	10.6	Mar. 31, 1938	117,874 lei	865	44
Spain	25.0	Dec. 31, 1935	21,779 pesetas	2,977	119
Sweden	6.3	Mar. 31, 1939	2,607 krona	629	100
Switzerland	4.2	Dec. 31, 1938	2,753 francs	623	148
Union of South Africa	9.9	Mar. 31, 1939	280 pounds	1,298	131
United Kingdom	47.4	do	8,163 pounds	38,247	807
United States	129.8	June 30, 1939	41,141 dollars	41,141	317
Yugoslavia	15.4	Mar. 31, 1939	24,620 dinar	561	36

Source: League of Nations Statistical Yearbook 1938-39.

WHY NATIONAL DEBT NOT REDUCED IN TWENTIES

I have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania make many statements relative to the necessity of reducing the national debt. My opinion is, if we were to attempt to substantially reduce the national debt now we would have more trouble than we are having over the increase of the national debt.

During the World War Woodrow Wilson and a Democratic Congress passed tax laws which would have raised sufficient taxes within a reasonable length of time after the war to have paid off the national debt in its entirety. In that way it was contemplated that those who profited most by reason of the war would have to pay the cost of the war through high income taxes and gross receipts taxes, but when the Republican administration came into power in 1921 an effort was made to drastically reduce taxes, and the following reasons were assigned:

First. That more than one generation should pay the cost of the war; that it was not fair to compel the cost of the war to be paid by the then generation in such a short period of time.

Second. That it was necessary to have a large national debt in order that banks, insurance companies, representatives of estates, and managers of trust funds may have a safe place to invest their surplus and reserve funds. The argument was made that every concern handling trust funds and surplus funds for the people should have a big backlog of Government bonds to rely upon in the event of trouble, and if the national debt should be paid off such a safe investment would not be obtainable.

Third. Because haste in reduction in the national debt would cause general deflation, and the ultimate extinguishment of the debt would cause a destruction of property values.

I have heretofore placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table prepared by Government officials, which disclosed that our entire national debt would have been paid by June 30, 1927, if the Woodrow Wilson taxes had remained in effect. Sentiment was so strong in administration circles against paying the national debt that taxes were reduced instead. This allowed the war profiteers to keep their profits. Such reputable concerns as C. F. Childs & Co., specialists in Government securities, warned the people as follows:

The national debt's ultimate extinguishment will cause virtually all price levels to drop and haste in reduction will tend to precipitate general deflation with its attendant disturbances.

In other words, the people were told we must keep a large national debt to prevent deflation, something that was very much feared since the people had just gone through the most deflationary period in history in 1920.

IF ALL DEBTS PAID NO MONEY

Suppose everybody paid their debts and suppose all States, counties, cities, and the Federal Government should pay their debts, we would not have any money or credit with which to transact the enormous business of our country. It is said

LXXXVI—190

that we should pay all of our debts. Our economy, as foolish as it may seem, is based on debt. Debts must be created in order to prevent the people from being reduced to barter and in order to have a sufficient circulating medium. In recent years, individuals and corporations have been paying their debts and the States, counties, and cities have not been increasing their debts, so it was necessary for the Federal Government to increase its debt, in order to have sufficient circulating medium in the form of credit with which to transact the business of the country.

Our total debts—public and private—are less today than they were in 1929.

WHICH PREFERRED—INCREASE NATIONAL DEBT OR DEFLATION, REPUDIATION, AND BANKRUPTCY

Since England, France, and Italy have experienced neither inflation nor repudiation by reason of their large national debts, I see no reason why we should get excited about our national debt when it is small compared to the national debts in these countries.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] desire deflation which will produce bankruptcy and repudiation of debts and cause the ownership of all tangible property to be further concentrated into the hands of a few people? Does he want the national debt increased, if necessary, or does he prefer that the President issue a part of the \$3,000,000,000 he is authorized to issue under the present law?

THUMB-TWIRLING TWENTIES

If the Republican Party which went into power in 1921, under the leadership of Andrew W. Mellon, had paid the national debt as contemplated when the war taxes were put on—to make the war profiteers pay the cost of the war—our national debt today would be less than \$20,000,000,000. We have been paying a billion dollars a year interest the past few years. Our present national debt includes not only the amount that should have been paid in the thumb-twirling twenties but also interest on it as well as the expenditures since 1933.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address that I delivered in Washington last Wednesday before the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the American Legion magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

THE VENAL VOICE OF BABSON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, what Senator Borah once called "the venal voice of Babson" has again been raised in defense of the utilities monopolies.

You will see from the statement of Mr. Roger Babson in this morning's Washington Post that he is now acting as a utility propagandist. He is attacking the Securities and Exchange Commission for proposing to do its duty by enforcing the Holding Company Act.

From reading Mr. Babson's outburst, one would think that these beneficent holding companies are being outraged by a ruthless government, and that innocent investors are being made to suffer.

The truth of the business is that these vast monopolies which Mr. Babson is defending, and which claim investments of approximately \$13,000,000,000 in the capital structures, really and truly have legitimate investments of something like \$5,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000. The other \$6,000,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000 is inflated valuations representing nothing in God's world but wind, water, and Power Trust rascality.

Yet these huge combinations are siphoning from the pockets of the consumers of electricity throughout the country overcharges to pay dividends on these inflated valuations that do not represent any real investments at all.

As I have pointed out before, the Ontario power system generates and distributes about one-twelfth as much electricity as is used in the whole United States. The Ontario system has an investment of only \$400,000,000. On that basis, the investment in the United States should amount to about \$4,800,000,000. Take that \$4,800,000,000 from their alleged investments of \$13,000,000,000, and it will leave \$8,200,000,000 of inflated valuations.

Even if you add 50 percent in order to be entirely fair, it would still leave an investment of less than \$7,000,000,000.

In order to pay dividends on these inflated values and to pay all the waste and extravagance and rake-offs of these useless holding companies and their high-salaried officials, electric light and power rates throughout the Nation are held so high as to wring from the ultimate consumers overcharges amounting to approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. Babson has now joined in this barrage of propaganda to try to prevent the Securities and Exchange Commission from breaking up these large, useless holding companies as the law provides, and stopping them from robbing the consumers of electric energy and plundering the innocent investors of the Nation.

If the Securities and Exchange Commission will do its duty now, it will result in reductions in light and power rates of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the overburdened consumers throughout the country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question; yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I made a moment ago, and to include a table prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief letter from Secretary Hopkins to Senator TOBEY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, together with supplementary information covering the period July 1 to September 30, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 15, 1940.

THE CENSUS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 or 3 days we have been flaunted with outcries by Harry Hopkins, that autocratic bureaucrat in the Commerce Department, denouncing everybody about their advice to people about the questions to be asked in the forthcoming census, and he refers to every paragraph in the Census Act except the one which absolutely prohibits him from asking the questions to which he has referred. Section 4 of that act absolutely limits the census inquiry to population, agriculture, irrigation, drainage, distribution, unemployment, and to mines, and those questions that relate to personal affairs of people, such as their income and that sort of thing, are absolutely in violation of the law, and he knows it if he knows anything about his business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day, and the Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar.

WAPATO SCHOOL DISTRICT, YAKIMA COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3824) to provide funds for cooperation with Wapato School District No. 54, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING OFFICERS, UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE, TO MAKE ARRESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5409) to authorize certain officers of the United States Indian Service to make arrests in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRIALS IN ISSUE OF GOOD BEHAVIOR, FEDERAL JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5939) to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges.

Mr. CELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman object to my request?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object also.

TIDAL POWER, PASSAMAQUODDY BAY

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 57, authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPEDITIOUS SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES WITH UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6324) to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I object.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1790, to authorize additions to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., through exchanges under the act of March 20, 1922, or by proclamation or Executive order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6972, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6314, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MISSISSIPPI PARKWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to authorize a national Mississippi River parkway and matters relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to establish a national land policy, and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBES OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 290, referring the claims of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma to the Court of Claims for finding of fact and report to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT FLORENCE STATION, CITY OF OMAHA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7069, authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIMITATION OF PRESENT LAWS WITH RESPECT TO COUNSEL IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7032, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RELIEF OF INDIANS WHO HAVE PAID TAXES ON ALLOTTED LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 952, for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted lands for which patents in fee were issued without application by or consent of the allottees and subsequently canceled, and for the reimbursement of public subdivisions by whom judgments for such claims have been paid.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse Indian allottees and Indian heirs of allottees for all taxes paid on so much of their allotted lands as, having been patented in fee prior to the expiration of the period of trust, without application by or consent of the patentee, has been or may be restored to trust status through cancellation of the fee patent by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That in any case in which a claim against a State, county, or political subdivision thereof for taxes collected upon such lands while the patent in fee was outstanding has been reduced to judgment, and such judgment remains unsatisfied, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon reimbursement by him to the Indian of the amount of taxes, including penalties and interest, paid thereon, and upon payment by the State, county, or political subdivision thereof of the costs of the suit, to cause such judgment to be released: *Provided further*, That in any case in which such a claim has been reduced to judgment and such judgment has been satisfied, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon proof of satisfaction thereof, to reimburse the State, county, or political subdivision thereof, for the actual amount of the judgment, exclusive of the costs of litigation.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Any appropriations made pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CROP-LOAN LAW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7878, to amend the crop-loan law relating to the lien imposed thereunder, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILEAGE TABLES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 506, relating to mileage tables for the United States Army and other Government agencies, and to mileage allowance for persons employed in the offices of Members of House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DELAWARE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6535, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Delaware Tribe of Indians on account of permanent annuities under treaty provision.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEASING OF RESTRICTED ALLOTMENTS OF DECEASED INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8024, to provide for the leasing of restricted allotments of deceased Indians in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That restricted allotments of deceased Indians may be leased by the superintendents of the reservation within which the lands are located (1) when the heirs or devisees of such decedents have not been determined and (2) when the heirs or devisees of the decedents have been determined, and such lands are not in use by any of the heirs and the heirs have not been able during a 3 months' period to agree upon a lease by reason of the number of the heirs, their absence from the reservation, or for other cause, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The proceeds derived from such leases shall be credited to the estates or other accounts of the individuals entitled thereto in accordance with their respective interests.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INVESTIGATE SUPPLY OF TIN

The Clerk called the next business, House Resolution 275.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to advise the House this resolution provides for an investigation of the supply of tin. I wrote to the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce asking them if they did not have the information that this resolution would provide. All three of them advised me that they do have the information and that it is kept up from week to week. Why therefore should we authorize an expenditure of \$5,000 or \$10,000 out of the contingent fund when the information is already available? As the investigation proposed would serve no useful purpose, I object to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. PACE, and Mr. TABER objected.

INTEREST RATE ON LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8450, to make permanent the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and land bank commissioner loans.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas accept an amendment to make this 5 years instead of permanent?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have talked with several members of the committee and we have no objection to the amendment so far as I have been able to ascertain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of paragraph "Twelfth" of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to the 3½-percent interest rate on Federal land bank loans), is amended by striking out "occurring within a period of 5 years, commencing July 1, 1935," and inserting in lieu thereof "occurring at any time after July 1, 1935."

(b) The fourth sentence of such paragraph "Twelfth" (relating to the 1940 time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction) is repealed.

Sec. 2. The last paragraph of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, as amended (relating to reduction in the interest rate on loans by the Land Bank Commissioner), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 1, line 8, after the word "occurring", strike out "at any time after" and insert "within a period of 10 years commencing."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "is", strike out the word "repealed" and insert "amended to read as follows: 'No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1945.'"

Page 2, line 12, after "1937", insert a comma and the following: "and prior to July 1, 1945."

Page 1, after the period in line 9, insert "The provisions of such paragraph 'Twelfth' of section 12 of such act shall be applicable to interest on so-called purchase-money mortgages in the case of interest payable on installment dates occurring after the date of the enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to extend for 5 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and land bank commissioner loans."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 2, line 10, after the word "exceed", strike the figure "4" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3½."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have not talked to any other members of the committee about this particular amendment, but, personally, I have no objection to it, because I see no reason why the rate should not be lower.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to offer an amendment to H. R. 8450 similar to that just now offered by my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. MURRAY. I shall, however, withhold it because my purpose is not authorship but results. I cheerfully defer to my distinguished colleague, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, who sees eye to eye with me in this matter.

The adoption of this amendment will accomplish the objectives which I have been working for and which are stated in my bill, H. R. 5285, introduced in the House on March 23, 1939, and which I discussed on the floor of the House the following day.

Two weeks ago, March 4, 1940, when the pending bill came before the House I pointed out the merits of the measure and suggested that by amendment it could be made to conform to my bill.

If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted, the bill now before the House will accomplish the exact purposes with reference to interest rates which my bill proposes.

As I have stated on other occasions, this bill will not solve the problems of agriculture, but it will help to solve them. It will reduce the overhead expenses of farm operation. It will tend to preserve private ownership of farm property. I urge the adoption of the pending amendment and recommend the bill with this amendment for final passage.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge on the House that this very worth-while amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] be adopted. This is one of the best ways I know in which this Congress can help the farmers of the Nation, and that is by giving them as low interest rates as possible. To many farmers the extra burden of high interest rates on farm mortgages has proven to be the straw that broke the camel's back.

The House today, by establishing for 5 years the rate of 3½ percent on commissioner loans, as well as the regular land-bank loans, can do much to help farmers stay on their farms and off of the relief rolls. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL-FOREST ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7643, to facilitate and simplify national-forest administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the determination and collection of amounts due for sale of national-forest products and use of national-forest lands shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be final and conclusive on all agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That permits, contracts, agreements, or other instruments requiring payments into the Treasury of the United States on account of sale of national-forest products, use of national-forest land, or other sources of national-forest revenue, including contributions by co-operators in connection with authorized activities of the Forest Service, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 20, title 41, United States Code, when the permit or other instrument does not require payment to the Government in excess of \$300 in any one fiscal year.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "and", insert the following: "where the payment to the United States does not exceed the sum of \$300 in any one fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF INDIANS OF CROW RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5477, for the benefit of the Indians of the Crow Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided, That for the purpose of consolidating the restricted land holdings of any individual Crow allottee or the holdings of members of a Crow family, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to approve sales of allotted and inherited Indian lands to members of the Crow Tribe or the exchange of restricted Crow lands without regard to the acreage limitation hereinbefore set out. Any sales made hereunder shall be upon a petition signed by the adult allottee and by the adult heirs of any deceased allottee and the parent or natural guardian of a minor heir or, if there be no natural guardian, by the officer in charge of the Crow Agency, and if the purchaser of such lands be an Indian of the Crow Tribe, then any outstanding trust patent or patents covering the land so sold shall be canceled and a new patent of the force and legal effect of the trust patents as prescribed by the General Allotment Act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388), as amended, shall be issued to such Indian, which patent where applicable shall contain the mineral reservation provided in section 6 of this act. Should any Crow allottee wish to retain mineral rights now owned by him in land, sold hereunder to other members of the tribe, he may do so by making conveyance on a form of deed to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, which form shall provide that its approval shall not operate to remove any trust or other conditions imposed upon said lands as expressed in the original trust or any other patent issued therefor."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "to read as follows", and insert "by inserting the following at the end of paragraph 1."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "sales", insert "or exchange."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "purchaser", insert "or recipient."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "sold", insert "or exchanged."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "Indian", insert "or Indians."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTION OF MINORS BY INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8499, relating to adoption of minors by Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone will make a brief statement with reference to this bill? If not, I shall have to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to the adoption of minors. It provides that unless there shall have been adoption by judgment or decree of a State court, or by a judgment or decree of an Indian court, or by a written adoption approved by the superintendent of the agency having jurisdiction over the tribe of which either the adopted child or the adoptive parent is a member, and duly recorded in a book kept by the superintendent for that purpose, or by an adoption in accordance with a procedure established by the tribal authority, recognized by the Department of the Interior, of the tribe either of the adopted child or the adoptive parent, and duly recorded in a book kept by the tribe for that purpose, or unless such adoption shall have been recognized by the Department of the Interior prior to the effective date of this act or in the distribution of the estate of an Indian who has died prior to that date.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think it would be fair to have a 6-month period, at least during which the Indians might be given notice, and then adoptions that have been made in accordance with the tribal custom may be put on record so that they may be protected?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. It does not affect anything that has been done in the past. It only provides for future cases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even there the gentleman knows Indian families have taken children in and, to all intents and purposes, have adopted them; but unless there is some way for these adoptions to be put on record or to be recognized in some way, an injustice might be done.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. That may be true. It would not affect those who have been adopted in the past, because it is provided that if it has been done by a decree of an Indian tribe it shall be valid. The main requirement is that in the future there must be a record kept. The bill provided that the tribe itself shall keep the record, but we finally decided to place this obligation on the Indian Department.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the bill may be very good, but perhaps it would be desirable if there was a period of time established so that they might be put on record.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I really do not think that would be necessary, but I do not see why an amendment to that effect would be objectionable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice, until I can satisfy myself that no injustice will be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will look into this matter, I think he will decide it will be all right. The next time the bill comes up for consideration I trust he will not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall examine the bill and if it contains a 6-month notice clause or if the gentleman will agree to an amendment to that effect, I will make no objection to returning to the bill later today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6957, to extend to the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]?

There was no objection.

PRICES AND GRADES OF COTTONSEED AND COTTONSEED PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8642, to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state the reasons for his objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any objection to the bill. The Consent Calendar is supposed to have on it only bills of minor importance. This bill establishes a policy which makes an indeterminate authorization of funds and personally I think it is too important a bill to be considered on the Consent Calendar. I do not think the Members have been fully advised with reference to what the bill is about and I hope the gentleman will try to get a

rule to take it up so that we may have some time to discuss and consider it. Perhaps there will not be any objection.

I do not know enough about it to object to it. I do not believe I would object to it, because it looks all right to me, but I believe the Members of the House should know what they are doing when they adopt a bill of this nature, a bill which is as broad as this seems to be in the formulation of policy.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but am I to understand that from now on the gentleman will oppose this bill's being considered on the Consent Calendar? I have never discussed this matter with the gentleman and I do not want to take up his time now, but I should be very pleased to discuss the matter with him in private.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In all fairness to the gentleman, I may say I believe I would continue to object to the consideration of the bill on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. DOXEY. If that is the attitude of the gentleman, there is nothing further for me to say.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTING BOUNDARIES OF THE CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL MONUMENT AND THE DIXIE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8476, to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

CITIZENSHIP RECOGNITION DAY

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 437, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim Citizenship Recognition Day for the recognition, observance, and commemoration of American citizenship.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last Sunday in May each year be, and hereby is, set aside as Citizenship Recognition Day and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition of all who, through coming of age or naturalization, have reached the status of active citizenship.

That the educational authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and for the full instruction of future citizens in their responsibilities and opportunities as active citizens of the United States and of the States and localities in which they reside.

With the following committee amendment:

Pages 1 and 2, strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the third Sunday in May each year be, and hereby is, set aside as Citizenship Day, and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition of all who, by coming of age or naturalization, have attained the status of citizenship.

"That the civil and educational authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and for the full instruction of future citizens in their responsibilities and opportunities as citizens of the United States and of the States and localities in which they reside.

"Nothing herein shall be construed as changing, or attempting to change, the time or mode of any of the many altogether commendable observances of similar nature now being held from time to time or periodically. But, to the contrary, such practices are hereby praised and encouraged.

"Sec. 2. Either at the time of the rendition of the decree of naturalization or at such other time as the judge may fix, the judge or someone designated by him shall address the newly naturalized citizen upon the form and genius of our Government and the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. It being the intent and purpose of this section to enlist the aid of the judiciary, in cooperation with civil and educational authorities, and patriotic organizations in a continuous effort to dignify and emphasize the significance of citizenship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Citizenship Day for the recognition, observance, and commemoration of American citizenship."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PUNISHMENT FOR ESPIONAGE AND OTHER CRIMES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1398, to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, as amended, to increase the penalties for peacetime violations of such act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there anyone here from the Committee on the Judiciary who can explain this bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill introduced by Senator BARBOUR, of New Jersey, to increase some of the penalties for espionage of the more flagrant types. The committee, through the committee amendments, takes the position that the minima which he prescribes are probably too severe and that more discretion should be allowed the courts in fixing the penalties, but both the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously reported the bill favorably as to its maximum penalties, and, with the committee amendments, that will be the substance of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1 of title I of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the last semicolon in such section and all matter following such semicolon, and (2) inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

(b) Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting in title I thereof, immediately after section 1 of such title, a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 1A. Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of title I of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 20 years", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 10 years and not more than 20 years."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of title I of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Whoever harbors or conceals any person who he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, has committed, or is about to commit, an offense under this title shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2 of title II of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

(b) Section 3 of title II of such act as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and shall, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 5. Section 1 of title III of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 10 years and not more than 20 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 6. Section 1 of title IV of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 10 years and not more than 20 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 7. Section 6 of title V of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000."

SEC. 8. Sections 1, 2, and 3 of title VIII of such act, as amended, are amended by striking out of each of such sections "shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both", and inserting in lieu of the matter stricken out the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$5,000."

SEC. 9. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of title IX of such act, as amended, are amended by striking out of each of such sections "shall be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$2,000."

SEC. 10. Section 22 of title XI of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$1,000."

SEC. 11. Section 3 of title XII of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$5,000."

With the following committee amendments:

Pages 1 and 2, strike out lines 3, page 1, down to and including line 23 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 1 of title I of the act entitled 'An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917, as amended, is amended by striking out 'shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years and may, in the discretion of the court, be fined not more than \$10,000.'"

Page 2, line 24, strike out "Sec. 3" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2."

Page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 3."

Page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 3, line 18, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Pages 3 and 4, strike out all of section 5 of the bill from page 3, line 21 to page 4, line 2, inclusive.

Page 4, line 3, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 4."

Page 4, line 7, strike out the words "not less than 10 years and."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "Sec. 7" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 5."

Page 4, line 14, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 4, line 17, strike out "Sec. 8" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 6."

Page 4, line 22, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 4, line 25, strike out "Sec. 9" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 7."

Page 5, line 4, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 5, line 7, strike out "Sec. 10" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 8."

Page 5, line 11, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

Page 5, line 14, strike out "Sec. 11" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 9."

Page 5, line 18, strike out the words "not less than 5 years and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8540, to authorize an increase in the White House police force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create the White House police force, and for other purposes", approved September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 841, as amended; U. S. C., Supp. IV, title 3, sec. 62), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The White House police force shall consist of 1 captain with grade corresponding to that of captain (Metropolitan Police), 2 lieutenants with grade corresponding to that of lieutenant (Metropolitan Police), 4 sergeants with grade corresponding to that of sergeant (Metropolitan Police); and of such number of privates, with grade corresponding to that of private of the highest grade (Metropolitan Police), as may be necessary, but not exceeding 73 in number. Members of the White House police shall be appointed from the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force from lists furnished by the officers in charge of such forces. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD FACILITIES, SEATTLE, WASH., AND CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8537, to provide for the enlargement of the Coast Guard depot at Seattle, Wash., and for the establishment of a Coast Guard servicing base at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such additional land adjacent to the present Coast Guard depot at the foot of Twenty-seventh Avenue West, Seattle, Wash., and to make such improvements thereon as may be necessary for the development of the depot to best meet the needs of the Coast Guard.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such land and to make such improvements thereon as may be necessary for the establishment of a Coast Guard servicing base in such locality as the Commandant of the Coast Guard may recommend at or in the vicinity of Chattanooga, Tenn.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "acquire", insert a comma and the words "at a cost not to exceed \$8,500."

Page 2, line 2, after "acquire", insert a comma and the words "at a cost not to exceed \$5,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIVISION OF THE WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1759, granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the author of the bill, inasmuch as the Yellowstone River is the headwaters of the Missouri River, which flows into South Dakota and is as important to it as to North Dakota, if the gentleman would object to an amendment inserting "South Dakota" after the words "North Dakota"?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to the gentleman that this bill, which has already passed the Senate, simply gives to the States of North Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana the right to enter into a compact with reference to the division of the waters of the Yellowstone River before they flow into the Missouri River. I really do not see, therefore, where the Missouri River is involved in this matter. I imagine my good friend and colleague from South Dakota is concerned about the waters of the Missouri River. However, I may say that if the gentleman insists upon amending the bill by including the State of South Dakota, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact

or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River be, and it is hereby, amended to provide that the consent of Congress is given to the State of North Dakota to negotiate and to enter into the compact or agreement therein authorized providing for an equitable division and an apportionment between the States of the water supply of the Yellowstone River and of the streams tributary thereto, upon condition that the representative appointed by the President of the United States under the act of August 2, 1937, to participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and to report to Congress of proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into, shall continue to represent the United States and to report under this act: *Provided*, That such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of the said States and by the Congress of the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within or tributary to the Yellowstone National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands within the boundaries thereof.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 1, line 8, strike out "State" and insert "States", and in line 9, after "Dakota", insert "and South Dakota."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River."

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AT FAYETTEVILLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7421, to provide for terms of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas at Fayetteville.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 144 (a), (b), (c), (d)), be, and they are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 71. (a) The State of Arkansas is divided into two districts, to be known as the western and eastern districts of Arkansas.

"(b) The western district shall include five divisions constituted as follows: The Texarkana division, which shall include the territory embraced on July 1, 1920, in the counties of Sevier, Howard, Little River, Pike, Hempstead, Miller, Lafayette, and Nevada; the El Dorado division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Columbia, Ouachita, Union, Ashley, Bradley, and Calhoun; the Fort Smith division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Polk, Scott, Logan, Sebastian, Franklin, Crawford, and Johnson; the Harrison division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Baxter, Boone, Carroll, Marion, Newton, and Searcy; and the Fayetteville division, which shall include the territory embraced on such date in the counties of Benton, Madison, and Washington.

"(c) Terms of the district court for the Texarkana division shall be held at Texarkana on the second Mondays in May and November; for the El Dorado division, at El Dorado on the third Mondays in April and October; for the Fort Smith division, at Fort Smith on the second Mondays in January and June; for the Harrison division, at Harrison on the first Mondays in April and October; and for the Fayetteville division at Fayetteville on the second Mondays in March and October: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Fayetteville are furnished without expense to the United States: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the provision of quarters for the officers of said court and appropriate courtrooms for the holding of the sessions of said court in any new Federal building which may be constructed in Fayetteville.

"(d) The clerk of the court for the western district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Texarkana, Fort Smith, El Dorado, Harrison, and Fayetteville. Such offices shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "(b)", strike out the comma and "(c) and (d)" and insert "and (c)."

Page 1, line 5, after "(b)", strike out the comma and the words "(c), (d)" and insert "and (c)."

Page 3, strike out subsection (d), after line 6, through line 11, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFIRMATION OF TITLE TO CERTAIN RAILROAD GRANT LANDS IN KERN COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 1788, to confirm title to certain railroad grant lands located in the county of Kern, State of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land hereinafter described, which was patented by the United States to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. on December 1, 1891, recorded at Kern County, Calif., January 15, 1892, and now held and occupied by the Summit Lime Co., a California corporation, as successor in interest of the said railroad company through successive conveyances, and as grantee in a quitclaim deed from the said company executed December 21, 1937, is hereby released, relinquished, and confirmed to the said Summit Lime Co., the said land, situate, lying, and being in the east half of section 21, township 32 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo base line and meridian, county of Kern, State of California, described as follows:

Commencing at a point in the west line of the east half of said section 21, distant fifty feet northerly measured at right angles from the center line of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company's eastward main tract; thence south eighty degrees twenty-three minutes east parallel with said center line a distance of one hundred and thirty-six and three-tenths feet to the point of beginning of the parcel of land to be described; thence continuing south eighty degrees twenty-three minutes east parallel with said center line a distance of two hundred and sixty feet; thence north nine degrees thirty-seven minutes east fifty feet to a point in the northerly line of the right-of-way of said railroad company; thence north eighty degrees twenty-three minutes west along said northerly line of right-of-way a distance of two hundred and sixty feet; thence south nine degrees thirty-seven minutes west a distance of fifty feet to a point of beginning, containing an area of two hundred and ninety-eight one thousandths of an acre, more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, beginning with the word "which", strike out all following language up to and including the figure "1892" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "forming a part of the right-of-way granted to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. by the act of July 27, 1866 (14 Stat. 292)."

Page 3, line 23, after the word "less", insert the following: "": *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not in any instance diminish said right-of-way to a width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks of said Southern Pacific Railroad Co. as now established and maintained: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Southern Pacific Railroad Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Amend the title.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confirm title to certain railroad lands located in the county of Kern, State of California."

CONTINUATION OF GRAND JURIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8702, to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the continuation of grand juries to finish investigations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth sentence of section 284 of the Judicial Code as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 421), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows: "A district judge may, upon request of the district attorney or of the grand jury or on his own motion, by order authorize any grand jury to continue to sit during the term succeeding the term at which such request is made, solely to finish investigations begun but not finished by such grand jury, but no grand jury shall be permitted to sit in all during more than 18 months: *Provided*, That, for good cause shown, the court may, at any time after the end of the term for which the grand jury was originally summoned, excuse any member of the grand jury and summon and impanel another person in his place."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITIZENSHIP OF ALIENS WHO ENTERED THIS COUNTRY PRIOR TO FEBRUARY 5, 1917

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6381, for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice a statement in the report that a similar bill was introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress and passed the House but was not taken up by the Senate. These bills do not die at the close of a session unless there is a sine die adjournment of the Congress, and I take it from the statement in the report that the bill referred to is still pending in the Senate. If this is so, I wonder if there is any need for considering this particular measure. It seems to me it would be somewhat redundant if we passed this bill and sent it over to the Senate. Possibly there is a clerical error and the report refers to the Seventy-fifth Congress, and in order that this may be clarified I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNLAWFUL ENTRY OF MILITARY RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2739, to amend section 45 of the United States Criminal Code to make it applicable to the outlying possessions of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will someone please explain this bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which was introduced at the instance of the War Department to eliminate a question as to the application of the criminal law relating to military reservations in the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. The bill simply and more clearly confers jurisdiction upon the courts in criminal cases affecting military reservations in these outlying possessions. The report is unanimous. There has been no objection or question raised.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 45 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1097), be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after the word "Whoever" and before the word "shall", in the first line of said section, a comma, followed by the phrase, "within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES PERFORMING HAZARDOUS WORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6767) to provide additional compensation for employees killed or injured while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Looking at this bill, it would seem that some of these people would get a higher compensation than those who are actually wounded in battle and are totally disabled and also that widows of some of those who were killed in the war would receive.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, that may be true. I have not examined it, and neither did our committee, with a view to that comparison. The sole purpose of this bill, I say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, is, and the committee amendments so limit it, to give to anyone who is not a guard in the Treasury Department, or in similar service, who is actually engaged in law-enforcement activities of a hazardous nature, to be determined by the Compensation Commission, additional compensation when killed or wounded in the actual performance of that duty. It was thought by the committee that, inasmuch as these men are deprived, because of the hazardous nature of their occupation, of the privilege of life insurance and of health and casualty insurance, the bill as amended should pass. We believe these men

ought to be encouraged in the performance of their hazardous functions by giving this evidence of our appreciation. The fine men composing the services covered may be called on at any minute to risk their lives to protect the people of the United States from desperadoes.

We believe this is a sound bill. We have given it careful consideration at three different times. It has been amended in accordance with the views of the committee. It has the endorsement of all of the departments affected, six of them, and has the approval of the United States Federal Employees' Compensation Commission. It has had the careful study of the Treasury and the Budget, and is approved by all. We believe that there will be no serious objection to the bill upon its merits, although there may be some merit in the contrast which the distinguished gentleman has drawn. If so, then that should be corrected by legislation increasing the benefits of those the distinguished gentleman thinks are underpaid.

Mr. KEAN. I would like to check up with the veterans' legislation and see how it does compare. I did not have time to do it very carefully. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? Does he not think that probably the better way to accomplish that purpose would be to amend those other acts, to bring them in conformity with this? In other words, this bill, it seems to me, with all due respects to the gentleman's opinion—and I do regard it highly—ought to stand on its own merits, and if these men who would be the beneficiaries of this bill are honestly entitled to this consideration, then the fact that probably we have not been as generous as we ought to be toward some other groups, ought not to defeat this bill. If this bill is passed over, I will say to the gentleman that there is practically no chance of its passage at this session of Congress.

Mr. KEAN. Oh, I do not understand that that can be so. We will have another Consent Calendar day in 2 weeks.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, but we have to get it through the Senate also. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would follow me in just this additional thought. If on examination of the act he wishes to examine he finds the disparity is so great that he cannot go along, it will be a comparatively easy matter, I think, to stop the passage of this bill in the Senate, where it can be stopped by one objection also. The committee is absolutely unanimous in favorably reporting this bill as proposed to be amended. I beg the gentleman to withdraw his request, and let this bill pass.

Mr. CELLER. And there was no objection from any source.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 743, as amended; U. S. C., Supp. IV, title 5, sec. 756), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In cases of disability heretofore or hereafter resulting from personal injury sustained by an employee while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, if the employee was, at the time of the injury, regularly or specially assigned to law-enforcement activity, the United States shall pay to the disabled employee additional monthly compensation equal to one-half the monthly compensation to which the employee is otherwise entitled under this act, exclusive of the monthly sum authorized by this section, as amended, to be paid to disabled employees requiring the services of an attendant."

SEC. 2. Section 10 of such act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 744, as amended; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 760), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(M) In cases of death heretofore or hereafter resulting from personal injury sustained by an employee while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, if the employee was, at the time of the injury, regularly or specially assigned to law-enforcement activity, the United States shall pay to the widow, widower, or children of such employee additional monthly

compensation equal to one-half the monthly compensation otherwise payable to such widow, widower, or children under this act: *Provided*, That only so much of such additional compensation shall be paid in any case as will not increase the total monthly compensation paid to all beneficiaries of the deceased employee under this section to more than such employee's monthly pay: *Provided further*, That the compensation paid to any beneficiary other than such widow, widower, or children shall not be diminished by reason of the payment of such additional compensation."

Sec. 3. Section 14 of such act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 746; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 764), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In any case where, prior to the effective date of this paragraph, the liability of the United States for compensation under this act has been discharged by the payment of a lump sum pursuant to this section, and the disability or death for which such compensation was paid resulted from personal injury sustained by the employee concerned while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, if such employee was, at the time of the injury, regularly or specially assigned to law-enforcement activity, the United States shall pay to such employee, or to the widow, widower, or children of such employee, as the case may be, additional compensation equal to one-half that portion of such lump sum, heretofore paid by the United States on account of such disability or death which is not attributable to any period elapsing prior to the date of the enactment of this paragraph. Such additional compensation shall be payable monthly or in the manner prescribed by this section in the discretion of the Commission."

Sec. 4. Section 40 of such act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 750, as amended; U. S. C., Sup. IV, title 5, sec. 790), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The term 'law-enforcement activity' means activity directed against criminals or persons suspected of crime, the safeguarding of prisoners of the United States, or the protection of property of the United States."

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to entitle any person to any additional compensation for any period elapsing prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The term 'law-enforcement activity' shall mean the investigation or detection of violations of law, the investigation, detection, or apprehension, of criminals or persons suspected of crime, or the safeguarding of prisoners of the United States, but it shall not include the guarding of prisoners incarcerated in Federal penal institutions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO MARMET, W. VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1750) authorizing the Secretary to convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the town of Marmet, W. Va., subject to the reservations and conditions hereinafter contained, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two tracts of land situated on the west side of the Great Kanawha River, at lock and dam No. 2, in Marmet, W. Va., and described as follows:

Tract No. 1. Beginning at an iron pin in the eastern right-of-way line of the old county road at the southwest corner of the A. J. Baker land (now the property of the United States); thence, from said point of beginning, and running along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-six degrees fifty-seven minutes west one hundred and seventy-one feet to an iron pin in said line; thence, continuing along and with said eastern right-of-way line, north twenty-three degrees fifty-eight minutes west two hundred and eleven and five one-hundredths feet, to an iron pin in said right-of-way line at southerly corner of the lands of Mary B. Meyers, and the northwest corner of the said A. J. Baker land; thence, along and with the Meyers-Baker boundary line, north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east one hundred and twenty-one and eighteen one-hundredths feet, to an iron pin in the intersection of the westerly right-of-way boundary line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company; thence, and running with and along the said Charleston Interurban Railroad right-of-way line, south twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes east two hundred and sixteen and thirty one-hundredths feet to an iron pin in said right-of-way line; thence, continuing with and along said right-of-way line, south twenty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty-six and fifty-two one-hundredths feet, to the point of intersection with the boundary line between the said A. J. Baker land and the H. H. Smalridge and Industrial Center subdivision of the town of Marmet; thence, with

and along said Baker-Industrial Center boundary line, south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west one hundred and twenty-three and eighteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing one and seven one-hundredths acres, more or less, and designated on United States Army Engineers' Plat, "Kanawha River Locks & Dam No. 2, Real Estate, U. S. Engineer Office, Huntington, W. Va., March 1935 (File No. 023-L2-11/1)", as "3-B".

Tract No. 2. Beginning at the point of intersection of the eastern boundary right-of-way line of the Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the northerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land, and on the right-of-way line between said Charleston Interurban Railroad and the West Virginia State Highway Route No. 61; then, from said point of beginning, and along and with said Baker line, north sixty degrees thirty-two minutes east four hundred and twenty and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said Baker line; then south twenty-nine degrees twenty-eight minutes east three hundred and thirty-eight and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to the intersection of the north line of a fifty-foot street (now unnamed); thence, with the line of said street, south sixty-one degrees twenty-three minutes west three hundred and seventy-nine and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point in said street line; thence north eighty-seven degrees thirteen minutes west seventy-four and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet, to a point in the right-of-way boundary line between the said Charleston Interurban Railroad Company and the West Virginia State Highway Route No. 61, said point being eighty-nine and seven one-hundredths feet distant, in a northwesterly direction, from the southerly boundary line of the A. J. Baker land; thence, running with and along said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-seven degrees west seventy-seven and forty-five one-hundredths feet, to a point in said boundary line; then, continuing with said right-of-way boundary line, north twenty-four degrees thirty-two minutes west two hundred and sixteen and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing three and three hundred seventeen one-thousandths acres, more or less, and being a part of the portion of the nine-acre Baker tract designated on said United States Army Engineers' Plat as "3-A." There is expressly excepted and reserved to the United States of America an easement of way for all right-of-way purposes whenever the same may be required, on, over, in, and across each of the two tracts hereinabove described, for the use and benefit of the United States of America, its successors and assigns, and there is likewise hereby excepted and reserved to the United States of America the perpetual easement and right to flood such part or parts of each of the two tracts of land hereinabove described as may be necessary so to do, from time to time, in the interests of navigation or flood control.

(b) The two tracts of land described in subsection (a) of this section are parts, and come out of, that certain lot, piece, and parcel of land containing nine and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, which was acquired by the United States through a condemnation proceeding had in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, sitting in the city of Charleston, W. Va., on November 9, 1933, and styled United States of America against A. J. Baker and others, a copy of the final decree in such proceeding being recorded on November 18, 1933, in the office of the clerk of the county court of Kanawha County, W. Va., in Deed Book No. 390, at page 527 thereof, to which reference is made for a more complete description.

Sec. 2. The two tracts of land, the conveyance of which is authorized by the first section of this act, shall be held and used by the grantee for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and for similar and related municipal purposes. The deed of conveyance of such tracts of land to be executed by the Secretary of War shall contain appropriate provisions to provide for a reversion of such tracts of land to the United States in the event the grantee shall fail to use, or shall cease using, them for such purposes or shall alienate, or attempt to alienate, any part of them.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED ORDNANCE, GUNS, PROJECTILES, ETC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7074, to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there anyone here to explain this bill? If not, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENTS TO ARROWROCK DAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8498, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the payment of the costs of repairs, resurfacing, improvement, and enlargement of the

Arrowrock Dam in 20 annual installments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would say that this bill should have gone to the proper committee and the Secretary of the Interior should have approved such a bill as this.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS IN CIVIL SUITS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HAWAII, AND ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8822, to extend original jurisdiction to district courts in civil suits between citizens of the District of Columbia, the Territories of Hawaii or Alaska, and any State or Territory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (b) of paragraph (1), section 24, of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 41; Supp. IV, title 28, sec. 41), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(b) Is between citizens of different States, or citizens of the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, or Alaska, and any State or Territory."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT RUSHMORE MEMORIAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8357, to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the Committee on the Library can give us some information with respect to the necessity for this increase for the Mount Rushmore Memorial?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not a member of the Committee on the Library, but I think I know what the bill contains.

At the present time the reserve consists of 1,500 acres. The bill proposes to increase it to 1,800 acres, or an increase of 300 acres. The additional 300 acres are in the national forest, so that it simply authorizes the transfer of 300 acres from the national forest to the Mount Rushmore Memorial Commission.

Mr. COSTELLO. There will be no cost in purchasing the land itself?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There will be no cost in purchasing the land. It is simply to be transferred from one Federal agency to another. It has been asked for by the Commission to protect the highways leading to the memorial. The Commission thought it desirable to have this land so that it could protect the land from going into private ownership, thereby making it possible to line the approach highways with buildings that might be objectionable.

Mr. COSTELLO. No additional maintenance cost is going to be incurred by the Government when this is added to the national park?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no money involved at all. The Government owns the land, but it is subject to location. If it goes into the reserve, it will not be. It is only 300 acres and, as I understand, lies immediately along the approach highways.

Mr. COSTELLO. And there are no improvements contemplated, such as roads and highways?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The roads and highways have been built by the State highway commission. It is for the protection of those already in existence.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota whether they have completed the Rushmore Memorial?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman mean the figures?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. They are working on them now, of course.

Mr. RICH. With the money that was appropriated it was understood that they would have sufficient to finish these figures. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My idea is the testimony of the sculptor and the testimony of the commission, printed in the Appropriations Committee hearings when the last appropriation was made. I was in South Dakota last week, but I did not get to the memorial, so I do not know just what the status is. Of course, they have an appropriation for this fiscal year. I was told they are working every day that the weather will permit them to work.

Mr. RICH. I was under the impression that this had been continued on for a great number of years, and it was supposed to cost \$200,000. We have put about a million dollars into it at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The Federal Government has appropriated a total of \$750,000, and those who have seen it will agree that it is the greatest memorial in America. The gentleman will be prouder of the Federal expenditure there than of any other that has been made for work of that kind.

Mr. RICH. If you add this additional ground to this park, certainly there must be in the minds of somebody the idea of trying to develop that, so that it will cost more than the \$750,000. Is that not the case?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think not. I am quite sure this 300 acres has absolutely no relation to any program of development other than to protect the money that has already been invested by protecting the approach highways. I am not in favor of enlarging the reserve unduly. It was my amendment when the Rushmore bill was passed, in 1938, that reduced the acreage from 4,000 requested to 1,500 acres. At the time we thought that was enough. It develops that the commission thinks 1,800 is needed to cover the approach roads.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make one observation with reference to this bill.

At the time the last appropriation was made for the Mount Rushmore National Park I was very much tempted to object but did not. As I understand the measure under discussion at the present time it does not call for any further appropriation on the part of the Government, but I do think that if the increased amount of land means that eventually they will come here for more money it might very well be looked into at the present time. I personally feel that we have appropriated all we should for carrying out the purposes of the Mount Rushmore National Park.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. If I were permitted to gamble in this House, and were a gambling man, I would wager that if this bill is passed they will be back here for more money next year.

Mr. TREADWAY. If they are I will object to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 607, to amend section 40 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in

the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

APPEAL OF CERTAIN CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7737, to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutional validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code, as amended, is further amended by adding a new section, immediately following section 266, and to be designated as section 266a, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 266a. (1) Whenever the constitutional validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, is drawn in question in any court of the United States, and the determination of such question involves any conflict with the exercise by any State of any governmental power of such State, or whenever the exercise of such Federal power would result in any impairment or abridgement of any governmental power asserted by or customarily exercised by any State, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, not already a party, the court having jurisdiction of the suit or proceeding shall certify such fact to the attorney general of such State. In any such case, the court shall permit such State to intervene and become a party for the presentation of evidence (if evidence is otherwise receivable in such suit or proceeding) and argument upon the question of the validity of the exercise of such power. In any such suit or proceeding such State, subject to the applicable provisions of law, shall have all the rights of a party and the liabilities of a party as to court costs to the extent necessary for a proper presentation of the facts and law relating to the validity of the exercise of such powers.

"(2) In any such suit or proceeding in any court of the United States to which the United States or any officer or agency thereof, or any State or agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, as such officer or employee, is a party, or in which any State has intervened and become a party, an appeal may be taken directly to the Supreme Court of the United States by the United States or any officer or agency thereof, or by any such State or any officer or agency thereof, upon application therefor or notice thereof within 30 days after the entry of a final or interlocutory judgment, decree, or order; and in the event that any such appeal is taken, any appeal or cross appeal by any party to the suit or proceeding taken previously, or taken within 60 days after notice of an appeal under this subsection, shall also be, or be treated as, taken directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the event that an appeal is taken under this subsection, the record shall be made up and the case docketed in the Supreme Court of the United States within 60 days from the time such appeal is allowed, under such rules as may be prescribed by the proper courts. Appeals under this subsection shall be heard by the Supreme Court of the United States at the earliest possible time and shall take precedence over all other matters not of a like character, except appeals prosecuted by the United States to review decisions wherein an act of Congress shall have been held unconstitutional. This section shall not be construed to be in derogation of any right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States under existing provisions of law.

"(3) As used in this section, the term 'court of the United States' means any district court of the United States, any circuit court of appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States; the term 'district court of the United States' includes the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; and the term 'circuit court of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. This act shall apply to suits and proceedings brought or pending on the date of its enactment as well as to suits and proceedings thereafter instituted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "constitutional."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "or", strike out the word "customarily."

Page 2, line 7, after the words "exercised by", strike out the word "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

Pages 2 and 3, strike out all of subsection (2), from page 2, line 21, to page 3, line 24, inclusive.

Page 4, line 1, strike out subsection No. "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes."

And a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This is the last eligible bill on the calendar for call today.

ADOPTION OF MINORS BY INDIANS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 563, H. R. 8499, relating to adoption of minors by Indians. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] objected when the bill was originally called but I understand he has withdrawn his objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in probate matters under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, no person shall be recognized as an heir of a deceased Indian by virtue of an adoption—

(1) Unless such adoption shall have been—

(a) by a judgment or decree of a State court;

(b) by a judgment or decree of an Indian tribal court;

(c) by a written adoption approved by the superintendent of the agency having jurisdiction over the tribe of which either the adopted child or the adoptive parent is a member, and duly recorded in a book kept by the superintendent for that purpose; or

(d) by an adoption in accordance with a procedure established by the tribal authority, recognized by the Department of the Interior, of the tribe either of the adopted child or the adoptive parent, and duly recorded in a book kept by the tribe for that purpose.

(2) Unless such adoption shall have been recognized by the Department of the Interior prior to the effective date of this act or in the distribution of the estate of an Indian who has died prior to that date: *Provided*, That an adoption by Indian custom made prior to the effective date of this act may be made valid by recordation with the superintendent if both the adopted child and the adoptive parent are still living, if the adoptive parent requests that the adoption be recorded, and if the adopted child is an adult and makes such a request or the superintendent on behalf of a minor child approves of the recordation.

SEC. 2. This act shall not apply with respect to the distribution of the estates of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes or the Osage Tribe in the State of Oklahoma, or with respect to the distribution of estates of Indians who have died prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "tribal."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD immediately following the Murray amendment to the bill H. R. 8450.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RELIEF IN DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a serious situation that is developing in this country on account of shortage of funds for W. P. A. which this Congress made available at the last session. There are many sections of the drought area where the people at this moment are hungry. I have reports from this area of North Dakota, from every mayor of every city, from county commissioners and everyone in authority. It is reported that there is a great amount of suffering in sight for the immediate future.

Permit me to say also that the Relief Administration in November certified 6,000 additional workers for North Dakota for a period of 2 months. They were kind enough to extend this for 3½ months, but everybody knows that in the Dust Bowl area there will be no income for the next several months, and I want to present to this Congress just what the situation is. It does not apply merely to North Dakota but applies likewise to all the Western States which have been affected by this drought scourge.

This House should remember that through poor crops and no crops and grasshoppers thousands of farmers have been foreclosed. Their personal property has been taken for feed loans, and, when dispossessed, they have found their way into the villages and cities with absolutely nothing to sustain them but their W. P. A. checks. The land which was taken from them, for the most part, is idle, their homes empty, but the unsatisfied desire of the mortgagee to oust them from possession has been satisfied. They are now unable to help themselves and, when cut off of the W. P. A. rolls, intense suffering will ensue. There is more than suffering involved in this situation, for, in my opinion, just as soon as enough people get hungry enough, they will finally take what they must have to sustain life, and this Congress should not press them that far. The argument made in this House by the ultraconservatives that this spending must stop has no force with hungry, defenseless people. It is altogether possible that a few people here and there could be starved and nothing would be done, but when it comes to starving thousands of good citizens in a land of plenty, I say to you it cannot be done. It is a good thing to balance the Budget, but balancing the Budget will not satisfy the hungry. Balancing the Budget means nothing to people who feel the pangs of hunger. There is just one question involved here: Is this Congress going to appropriate money to feed these people until they can get a job, or will the Congress tell these people to camp at the city dump ground and live on what they can dig out of the scrap heap while we here balance the Budget?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks telegrams and letters from these various civic organizations of the Northwest, a telegram from Governor Moses, and also a letter from the Federal Works Agency, indicating that Congress will have to make funds available if these people are to be recertified to the relief rolls.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1940.

The Honorable USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BURDICK: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letters of March 12 and March 13, 1940, enclosing six telegrams and two other communications sent to you from North Dakota relative to the need for additional employment on projects of this administration in that State. The enclosures are returned herewith.

The volume of employment on Work Projects Administration projects that can be authorized in any State depends upon three primary factors: (1) The amount of funds made available by the Congress; (2) local economic conditions as reflected in the number of needy employable persons who are out of work; and (3) the supply of State or locally sponsored projects which are suitable for operation by this Administration.

In accordance with the funds available at the present time, it is necessary to plan the operation of the work program during the remaining months of the current fiscal year on a substantially reduced basis. Regarding local economic conditions in North Dakota as reflected in the number of needy employable persons, this need has been met in that State to a much greater extent than has been possible in other States.

In November 1939 consideration was given by this Administration to the conditions in North Dakota caused by drought. An additional emergency employment authorization for 5,000 persons was granted to North Dakota for the employment for a period of 60 days of farmers whose means of livelihood was impaired by drought conditions. It was only intended to provide cash income for 2 months' work to supplement the income of those persons who were affected by the drought emergency. Since approximately 3½ months have elapsed since the emergency employment was authorized, it has become necessary to withdraw the special authorization. This is represented by the number of persons who will be separated from employment on projects operated by this Administration in North Dakota during March.

This Administration will continue to make every effort to provide the maximum employment under the current Budget circumstances. However, it is regretted that a substantial reduction in employment will be necessary during the remaining months of this fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. RAUCH,
Assistant Commissioner.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., March 16, 1940.

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK:

Kindly oppose reductions in W. P. A. funds.

H. M. LEONHARD,
Secretary, Local 229, A. F. of M.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., March 7, 1940.

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,

Washington, D. C.:

Williams County financially unable to provide for 111 families (about 500 people), whose W. P. A. assignments will be canceled in next few days. Williams County welfare office insists these families are still in need. Do everything possible to delay cancellation of these assignments until other Federal or State aid can be arranged.
WILLIAMS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., March 11, 1940.

USHER L. BURDICK,

United States Congressman,

Washington, D. C.:

Recent drastic termination of W. P. A. workers causing great deal of hardship. Eddy County is without sufficient funds to carry any increase in the relief load. Urge immediate reinstatement of those whose employment was terminated.

S. K. HAUGLAN,
County Auditor.

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK., March 11, 1940.

USHER L. BURDICK,

Representative,

Washington, D. C.:

Seventy W. P. A. employees in McKenzie County have received discharge effective March 12. All reviewed by W. P. A. and welfare board within past 90 days and certified as needy. Last check generally goes for past grocery purchases. No demand for farm labor likely this spring. State and county welfare boards without funds to meet additional load.

BOARD COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, MCKENZIE COUNTY.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., March 12, 1940.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Lay-off 2,385 W. P. A. workers middle North Dakota winter presents serious situation. The men laid off have had only short-time employment. No work in sight for months to come. Financial situation State and counties such that serious suffering may result unless reconsideration can be had. Please use utmost efforts secure reconsideration and reinstatement.

JOHN MOSES, Governor.

MCCLUSKY N. DAK., March 11, 1940.

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,

Washington, D. C.:

We have been informed that W. P. A. is laying off men in North Dakota and Sheridan County. Conditions are such that these now on W. P. A. are dependent on relief. The county and State are not able to provide for them. Do all you can to keep them on W. P. A. for the next 3 months.

By order of the county commissioners.

BEN F. KLUDT,
County Auditor, Sheridan County, N. Dak.

MINOT, N. DAK., March 12, 1940.

Hon. United States Representative USHER L. BURDICK,

Washington, D. C.:

W. P. A. action, laying off 122 men, Ward County, extremely serious. These men all heads of families, and acute suffering bound to follow. Still midwinter here. No opportunity for private employment. Please use your influence keep these men employed and off direct relief.

BOARD OF WARD COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
E. G. PIERSON, Chairman.

LINTON, N. DAK., March 15, 1940.

USHER L. BURDICK,

Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.:

Termination of employment W. P. A. workers is causing unrest and may result in violence and suffering unless action is taken immediately to have them reinstated. Emmons County is probably worst drought-stricken district in State, and no chance for these workers to find private employment. Can you give us any information or assurance of relief for this situation?

EMMONS COUNTY WELFARE BOARD.

GRAFTON, N. DAK., March 15, 1940.

United States Representative USHER BURDICK.

Washington, D. C.:

Re Walsh County Courthouse amendatory grant application, county made application for additional grant in January. So far no reply. Would appreciate your cooperation in securing favorable action.

B. A. GUDAJTES,
Walsh County Auditor.

LINTON, N. DAK., March 15, 1940.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Member of Congress,

Washington, D. C.:

Lay off of W. P. A. workers in Emmons County is serious. There is no work that the ones layed off can obtain. County is in no position to furnish aid, as there are no available funds. Please do all in your power to have them reinstated and put back on the rolls.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
By S. R. DORCH, Chairman.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., March 16, 1940.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
United States Congressman,

Washington, D. C.:

Present and proposed cut in W. P. A. quota will result in much hardship in this territory. Will you do all possible to prevent such action? City and county financially unable to carry the extra burden. Advise.

W. K. JOHNSON,
President of City Commission.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., March 16, 1940.

Hon. U. L. BURDICK,
Washington, D. C.:

Williams County had 130 W. P. A. 60-day drought-relief certifications; 111 of these were canceled, which throws a burden of approximately 500 people on the welfare board. Due to lack of money both in the State and county welfare board treasuries there is no provision made for the subsistence need of this group of people. There is no indication that there will be private employment of any kind to which this group can turn to earn their subsistence needs. It will be necessary within the next week to have some action taken toward making a plan for these 500 people, unless it is intended that they shall lack their subsistence needs.

C. E. RAFFERTY,
President, City Commission.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., March 36, 1940.

USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives:

League of North Dakota Municipalities, representing approximately 150 cities and villages in the State, urges you to use your best efforts to have Work Projects Administration reconsider cut of approximately 2,500 and to prevent further cuts in W. P. A. employment contemplated during next 3 months. Financial condition of State, counties, and cities is such that great distress among people will result if Federal funds are withdrawn. Please advise Mr. Atkinson what can be done.

P. M. CLARK,
President, Mohall.

H. W. SWENSON,
Vice President, Devils Lake.

H. C. CORRIGAN,
Trustee, Fargo.

H. T. HINTGEN,
Trustee, Wahpeton.

V. E. SANDBERG,
Trustee, Minot.

MYRON H. ATKINSON,
Executive Secretary, Bismarck.

BARNES COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
Valley City, N. Dak., March 13, 1940.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Representative for North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE: The recent blanket reduction in the number of certified workers effected by the Work Projects Administration resulted in the elimination of 58 families from the work-relief rolls here in Barnes County. The result of this action will work a great hardship and suffering among these men, women, and children. There is no private employment available at this time. It will be another 2 or 3 months before, in this rural county, there will be any great demand for farm laborers.

These families will immediately become direct-relief charges, and it is needless to mention that the funds in the county treasury are depleted to the extent that it will be impossible to provide adequately for their subsistence needs.

Further, it is the sincere opinion of this board, based on facts and previous experience, that at no time should a blanket reduction be made of certified W. P. A. clients, but instead, if a reduction must necessarily be effected, that it be made on a basis of relative need of the various families.

We trust that you may use your position and influence to help these distressed families and this financially embarrassed community by effecting a restoration of these unemployed families on the works program.

Respectfully yours,

GOTTFRIED J. KUHN,
Executive Secretary.
FRANK HEIMES,
Chairman.

FORMAN, N. DAK., March 12, 1940.

Gov. JOHN MOSES,
Bismarck, N. Dak.:

W. P. A. lay-off of 61 men in this county, effective immediately, will present grave problem for practically all of these families. There is no employment available. Very few persons will be able to get work with farmers in spring work, as most of farm work is done by their own labor. Nothing else in sight. County has hardly enough funds or resources to carry on the public-assistance programs and normal relief load. Discontinuing work relief program for these people now is indefensible. To lay off family workers without other employment available is cruel and heartless and must result in bitterness and disaster. Urge every effort be made to continue these people on W. P. A. at least until warm weather will lessen needs and perhaps give opportunity for livelihood otherwise.

H. C. LOUDEN, Chairman,
OED A. WYUM,
ANDY E. ANDERSON,
ALBERT F. SAEWART,
GEO. C. DAWSON,

Board of County Commissioners of Sargent County.

Attest:

R. W. SAFSTROM, County Auditor.

ELLENDALE, N. DAK., March 11, 1940.

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been working on the historical data project, No. 2770, for the past 148 hours, and last Friday, the 8th, I received my 403, and the reason they gave was out of funds. Now, I would like to know if that can be possible, as they seem to have plenty money for war purposes but nothing for destitute families right here at home, and think something should be done to correct the situation.

There are 62 other W. P. A. employees in this county that got their 403, and they must have some kind of work at once, as they all have families to support, and some have small babies. I have 6 to support, and I cannot be without work very long. Hoping to hear from you in regard to this serious situation at once.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR STRAND.

LA MOURE, N. DAK., March 15, 1940.

Senator LYNN J. FRAZIER,
Senator GERALD P. NYE,
Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,
Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN OF NORTH DAKOTA: We, the undersigned, are appealing to you for the recent actions taken by the W. P. A. procedure, in which we were all dismissed March 11. We are all in a position where we have no means for the care of our families, for food, and fuel. Some immediate action must be taken at once, as we cannot starve in the midst of plenty.

We, the undersigned, are not farmers, and feel strange to have been placed on the roll, and now kicked out with no recourse, which will have to be corrected, as there is no opening to earn a dollar anywhere.

We would suggest that all be dismissed, and reconsideration given to those that are in the greatest need of help. This would better conditions considerable; and that the selection be made by the county board. Trusting you take immediate action on the above matter. Until then we remain,

Yours very truly,

ELLIOTT KNUTSON,
Representative of the Twenty-fourth District.
CHARLES L. HOWST.
JACOB T. NANNERGA.
LEONARD SHELNEY.
MARTIN HALDER.
JOHN J. MILLER.
GROVER POTTS, Jr.

BOWBELLS, N. DAK., March 14, 1940.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Suffering and distress is bound to follow the recent lay-off of W. P. A. workers in Burke County. Approximately 50 families will be affected, who will seek relief from local relief agencies, which are without funds to care for them.

In this part of the State this is the most critical period, since there is absolutely no employment available, being practically in the middle of winter, and local relief agencies cannot take care of the poor that are on their list now.

Please do all in your power to persuade Federal officials to reconsider their recent order in order that those laid off may continue at work until spring at least.

Thanking you most kindly, I remain,

L. L. GRIFFITH,

Chairman, Board of Burke County Commissioners.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., March 16, 1940.

USHER L. BURDICK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned mayors of major cities in North Dakota, following telephone and telegraphic conference, are united in requesting that you do everything possible to get W. P. A. to reconsider action in discharging approximately 2,500 employees, and to prevent further cuts in employment announced in the press by Howard O. Hunter, Deputy Administrator. County welfare boards and cities are not in a position to take care of these unemployed unless Federal funds are available. Cities will cooperate to fullest extent in sponsors' contributions. Please advise Mr. Churchill as to what can be done.

F. O. Olsen, mayor, Fargo; J. Earl McFadden, mayor, Grand Forks; V. E. Sandberg, mayor, Minot; N. O. Churchill, mayor, Bismarck; Perry V. Johnson, mayor, Jamestown; W. E. Hocking, mayor, Devils Lake; W. K. Johnson, mayor, Dickinson; C. G. Byerly, mayor, Mandan; C. E. Raffety, mayor, Williston; F. E. Henderson, mayor, Grafton; T. K. Williams, mayor, Wahpeton; Fred J. Frederickson, mayor, Valley City.

MINOT, N. DAK., March 16, 1940.

Representative USHER L. BURDICK,

Washington, D. C.:

Recommend N. Y. A. program as a most valuable Government agency. Anything you can do for this program will serve our youth in a very special way. Our N. Y. A. students are superior in college achievements.

C. C. SWAIN, President, S. T. C.

DELEGATION OF CERTAIN REGULATORY FUNCTIONS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND CREATION OF POSITION OF SECOND ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. JONES of Texas submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1955) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate certain regulatory functions, and to create the position of Second Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Chief Justice Stone, of the eighth circuit court of appeals, at the memorial services held for the late Justice Butler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUFFERING INJURIES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revert to the consideration of the bill (S. 607) to amend section 40 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, No. 583 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

Mr. HOBBS. That we revert to that for a moment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to tell the gentleman. The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] asked unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice while I was engaged in another matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this request comes a little late. The membership on our side has left the floor for the moment and I do not think we can permit that bill to be taken up at this time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice because the committee report

does not give the information that it should contain. It refers to a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which does not appear in the report, and it indicates that the Secretary of the Interior would like to have an amendment added to the bill so that the payments to be made in accordance with this act, if passed, would come from private funds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of the business in order for the day and any previous orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks before the adoption of the Murray amendment to the bill (H. R. 8450) to extend for 5 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and land bank commissioner loans, No. 559 on the Consent Calendar, considered and passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE NEW DEAL AND THE NEGRO

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when there is such widespread propaganda throughout the country designed to have the electorate see what the minority party calls the utter failure of the New Deal administration, I wish to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House and the attention of the country to what this New Deal administration has done for America's largest and most neglected minority group—the Negro.

During the brief moments I shall speak to you I propose to deal specifically with seven governmental agencies which have been most active during this administration and which have touched the life of the Negro in a more or less effective way. These agencies are:

- First. Work Projects Administration.
- Second. Public Works Administration.
- Third. Civilian Conservation Corps.
- Fourth. Farm Credit Administration.
- Fifth. Farm Security Administration.
- Sixth. National Youth Administration.
- Seventh. United States Housing Authority.

THE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Created by an act of Congress "to provide work for needy persons on useful projects," the Work Projects Administration has attacked the problem of unemployment among Negroes with the result that during the calendar year of 1939 an average of 300,000 Negro workers were employed by W. P. A. These workers were engaged in a variety of occupations and earned some \$15,000,000 in monthly wages. They constituted 14 percent of all W. P. A. workers.

The projects which employed Negroes and served the Negro public have been of many types. These include road building and construction; health, recreational, and social services; education, research, and cultural development.

Road building and construction

Last year it was reported that 39,000 Negro workers were employed on W. P. A. highway, road, and street construction projects in 11 Southern States during the peak periods of employment. These workers contributed to the building and improvement of 68,000 miles of streets and roadways which were completed throughout the Nation during an 8-month period.

Negro building-trades workers, skilled and unskilled, were employed in the construction of public-school buildings, gymnasiums, auditoriums, and other public structures. Outstanding examples of W. P. A. built buildings for Negro use include the \$100,000 high school at Pine Bluff, Ark.; the \$12,000 civic center at Goldsboro, N. C.; and the \$100,000 memorial hospital in Tampa, Fla.

Health, recreational, and social services

Problems affecting the health of the Negro have been attacked through W. P. A. projects. Clinics, staffed by Negro physicians, dentists, nurses, and clerical workers, have been established in Negro communities in order to improve the health conditions of the people.

In many Southern cities the first public recreational facilities for colored people were made available by W. P. A. In other cities, as in New York, recreational facilities in the Negro community were considerably expanded by the W. P. A. through development of playgrounds, swimming pools, and parks. In Montgomery, Ala., there were seven recreational centers open to Negro children last summer. The program was extended to include small towns and rural areas. Local advisory councils were organized to sponsor the program in North Carolina. In one city the members of the advisory council and their friends made the bricks for the construction of a community house. Employment opportunities for Negro recreational workers were created by the program which also served to train inexperienced workers.

Needy school children have been served free hot lunches by W. P. A. workers. Busy mothers have, for periods during the day, been relieved of the care of babies and small children by nursery schools in many cities of the Nation. Sick and needy persons have been supplied with housekeepers during periods of illness.

Education, research, and cultural development

Half a million Negro men and women have been taught to read by teachers employed by W. P. A.'s adult-education project. Thousands of others have received instructions in skilled trades, in commercial work, and in the arts, as well as training in domestic service.

Upward of 10,000 Negro teachers and educational workers have received employment on the adult-education project. During the peak about 5,000 were employed and received annual earnings of between two and a half and three million dollars.

In Harlem the peak enrollment amounted to 8,000 persons who attended classes in 35 centers. These adult students were taught by 225 full-time teachers. Twenty-six trade and technical courses have been available at the New York Vocational High School. These courses include auto mechanics, electrical wiring, building maintenance, watch and clock repairing, upholstery, radio mechanics, cafeteria management and cooking, dressmaking, millinery, interior decoration, motors, and generators. A course in salesmanship trained many of the sales persons employed in retail merchandising in Harlem.

In North Carolina the Negro Adult Education Council is sponsoring the project's campaign to eliminate illiteracy among the 100,000 Negro adults who at the beginning of the drive were unable to read or write.

A variety of research projects have been sponsored by W. P. A. for the purpose of determining the economic and social status of the Negro. The largest of these projects was the survey of the urban Negro worker, directed by the Department of the Interior with W. P. A. funds amounting to nearly \$500,000. This project, administered by a Negro staff, employed 1,800 "white collar" workers in 80 cities in 31 States

and the District of Columbia. Over 330,000 persons were interviewed. The findings of this survey have been published in two volumes.

In Chicago, under sponsorship of the Institute for Juvenile Research, a W. P. A. project employing 125 persons conducted a survey of juvenile delinquency and crime on the South Side. Out of this study has come *The Chicago Negro Community: Statistical Description*. The scope of the project has been expanded to cover other phases of Negro life in that city. Studies of migrations and mobility among Negroes in Chicago and of associations and churches in the Negro community of Chicago are now being made by this project.

Other research projects delved into the Negro's past, investigated health and housing conditions, made studies of rural life, and evaluated his contributions to American culture.

Negroes were employed on all the arts projects. When the Federal theater project closed on August 31, 1939, some 800 Negro actors, directors, research workers, playwrights, technicians, and scenic workers were employed. Negro groups were responsible for some of the most widely publicized production of F. T. P., such as *MacBeth*, *Run Lil' Chillun*, *Haiti*, and *The Swing Mikado*. These and other Negro productions were witnessed by upward of 1,000,000 persons. Negro units of the project were organized in Hartford, Conn.; Boston, Mass.; New York City; Newark, N. J.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.; San Francisco and Los Angeles, Calif.

The Federal art project has been responsible for discovering and developing the talents of many Negro artists whose works have been widely exhibited. In New York a Negro art center has been established and has stimulated interest throughout the community in the potentialities and attainments of the Negro artist.

Likewise, the Federal music project has not only given employment to unemployed Negro musicians but has brought classical, popular, and folk music to thousands who never before were able to attend concerts. When Britain's King and Queen were guests in the White House last year they were entertained by a W. P. A. chorus of 28 Negro voices from North Carolina. They appeared on the program with America's most famous artists, Marian Anderson, Kate Smith, and Lawrence Tibbett.

It is estimated that 180 Negroes have been employed on the Federal writers project. These editorial workers have assembled material and prepared volumes on *The History of the Negro in Virginia*, *Negroes in New York*, *The Florida Negro*, and other phases of Negro life.

Negro personnel

Negro personnel has also been employed on the administrative staffs of the Federal, State, and district W. P. A. offices. During 1939 nearly 100 Negroes were employed in various capacities at W. P. A. headquarters in Washington. State administrations also made use of Negro workers as race relations officers.

These results in employment were facilitated by inclusion in the Emergency Relief Act of 1939 of clauses specifically forbidding "discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliation, or membership in a labor organization."

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The Public Works Administration was organized in 1933 for the purpose of combating unemployment in the building industry through grants for the construction of needed public buildings. Negroes have shared in this program through employment and through the development of projects for public use, including many that were primarily for the use of the Negro public. This construction work included the building of bridges, courthouses, power plants, and sewage-disposal plants for common use; community centers, schools, and hospitals, some of which were built in Negro areas and designed primarily for Negro use.

Schools

More than 115,000 Negro children in 24 States are attending schools built during the past few years with the aid of the Public Works Administration. This agency has

aided in the construction of or improvements to 829 different buildings, resulting in the addition of 2,886 class rooms for Negro students.

Exclusive of the allotments of \$3,502,678 to Howard University in Washington, the P. W. A. has made allotments for \$34,218,749 worth of non-Federal school buildings for Negro institutions. In addition to the classrooms constructed with the aid of these grants, many advantages to the students have been afforded through the construction of auditoriums, gymnasiums, libraries, assembly halls, recreation and dining halls, dormitories, and other housing facilities.

Of the \$34,218,749, approximately \$7,526,493 have been spent on construction of buildings at Negro colleges. Allotments have gone to 13 of the 18 publicly controlled 4-year colleges, 4 of the 6 publicly controlled teachers' colleges, all of the State normal schools, and 3 of the 7 publicly controlled junior colleges.

The magnificent million-dollar Founders Library at Howard University was built with P. W. A. funds. This building, which dominates the university campus, was designed by Negro architects, and its construction supervised by a Negro engineer. Its capacity of 200,000 volumes may easily be expanded to half a million and will be adequate for the needs of the university for many years to come.

Hospitals

At least 7,242 new beds have been made available for Negro patients in hospitals throughout the country through the aid of grants and loans by P. W. A. Nearly half of these beds, 3,486, are for the insane; 2,723 are in general hospitals, and 1,033 in tuberculosis sanatoria and other hospitals. The facilities range from 7-ward buildings accommodating 1,170 patients at the North Carolina State Hospital for the Insane at Goldsboro to a 5-bed ward at the Municipal General Hospital at Quitman, Ga. These hospitals are distributed through 17 southern and border States.

One of the largest and most modern hospitals erected for Negro patients during the past 5 years with the aid of P. W. A. funds is the Homer G. Phillips Municipal Hospital in St. Louis, Mo. Erected at a cost of more than \$3,000,000, this hospital has a capacity of 685 beds. It is composed of five buildings including a nurses' home and training school. The nurses' home provides dormitories for 146 nurses and 24 internes.

Other projects include the \$100,000 Norfolk Community Hospital, Norfolk, Va., and the \$700,000 tuberculosis annex to Freedmen's Hospital in Washington.

Speaking at the dedication of the Homer G. Phillips Hospital in St. Louis in 1933, Dr. Numa P. G. Adams, dean of the Medical College of Howard University, asserted that for the whole population there was 1 hospital for every 18,737 persons; for the Negro, 1 for every 107,127 persons. For the white population there was 1 hospital bed for every 110 persons; for the Negro, 1 for every 999. There was an average of 6.7 hospital beds available to each white physician, and only 1.1 for each Negro physician.

Recreation and community projects

Recreational and community facilities for Negroes have been augmented in many cities by grants and loans from P. W. A. In Lexington, Ky., the P. W. A. granted \$18,000 for the construction of a municipal swimming pool in Douglas Park. The pool, measuring 55 feet by 105 feet, has a capacity of approximately 200,000 gallons and will accommodate 350 persons. There is a separate wading pool for small children. Provisions have been made for dressing rooms and check rooms. The total cost of the project will be \$40,000.

Employment

Negro building-trades workers have benefited directly through the nondiscrimination labor policy covering the development of Federal projects. This policy asserts that "there shall be no discrimination because of race, color, creed, or political affiliations in the employment of persons on the project."

In addition to building-trades workers, P. W. A. has employed 14 Negro architects and 8 engineers. In many instances Negro workers were employed in the development of

P. W. A. non-Federal projects. Employment was also stimulated in the production, fabrication, and transportation of building materials, all industries in which thousands of Negroes are customarily employed.

Other employees of the P. W. A. included Negroes on the administrative staff, two Negro lawyers, research assistants, secretaries, clerical workers, and laborers.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Young Negro men throughout the country have participated in the rehabilitation and conservation program of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The program has afforded them employment, aided their families, many of whom have been on relief, schooled them in new trades and occupations, and contributed to the conservation of the Nation's natural resources.

The extent of this program among young Negro men is indicated by the following facts and figures. Approximately—

Two hundred and fifty thousand colored youths have served in the Corps since the Civilian Conservation Corps was initiated in 1933. Regular habits of work, training, discipline, fresh air, three well-prepared and ample meals a day have combined to improve the health and morale of all enrollees.

Thirty thousand young colored men and war veterans, one-tenth of the total C. C. C. enrollment, are actively participating in the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Seven hundred thousand dollars a month for the past year has been allotted by colored C. C. C. boys to their parents and dependents back home.

Ninety thousand books have been supplied through the War Department and the Office of Education for colored camp libraries.

Twelve thousand colored C. C. C. enrollees in the past 5 years have completed courses in first aid through cooperation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Red Cross.

Eleven thousand colored enrollees have been taught to read and write. More than 90 percent of the colored C. C. C. enrollees regularly attend C. C. C. classes from elementary to college level which are conducted in each camp's education building, which is well equipped and especially constructed for vocational instruction. Howard University, Wilberforce University, Tuskegee Institute, Hampton Institute, Florida Agriculture and Mechanics College at Tallahassee, Tennessee Agriculture and Industrial State College, and a number of other Negro colleges have granted scholarships and fellowships to C. C. C. enrollees.

Two thousand colored project assistants, leaders, and assistant leaders are on duty at C. C. C. camps.

Six hundred colored cooks are steadily employed in C. C. C. mess halls.

Nine hundred classes in Negro history were conducted in the camps during the past 5 years.

Eight hundred colored boys have gained business training in the capacity of store clerks and managers of the post exchanges in C. C. C. camps.

Four hundred colored typists are assigned to C. C. C. headquarters of the commanding officers, camp superintendents, and educational advisers.

One hundred and forty-seven colored college graduates are serving C. C. C. camps as educational advisers.

One thousand two hundred part-time, experienced teachers are actively engaged in instruction of these colored enrollees at C. C. C. camps.

Twenty-five colored medical Reserve officers and chaplains of the United States Reserve Corps are on active duty in the Nation's C. C. C. camps.

One hundred and six colored C. C. C. camps are located in forests, parks, recreational areas, fish and game reservations, and on drainage and mosquito-control projects.

Forty-eight colored C. C. C. companies are engaged on soil-conservation projects.

Two colored commanding officers with the rank of captain and lieutenant in the United States Reserve Corps are on active duty with the C. C. C., one at Gettysburg National

Park, Pa., and the other at Fishers Landing, N. Y. Four other line officers are on active duty at these two camps.

Four colored engineers and six colored technical foremen have served Pennsylvania camps for more than 2 years. At Gettysburg the camp superintendent is a Negro.

One colored historian, who received his Ph. D. degree from Columbia University, is included in the camp personnel at Gettysburg.

Fifteen million dollars has been obligated for clothing worn by colored enrollees, including shirts, underwear, trousers, socks, denim jumpers, shoes, caps, raincoats, and overcoats.

Nineteen million dollars has been expended for food served colored boys and men at camps during the past 6½ years.

One million five hundred thousand dollars has been received by railroads for transportation of colored C. C. C. enrollees to camp and back home again.

THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Negro farmers and wage earners have participated in the program of the Farm Credit Administration, which makes available to farm owners loans on easy terms. F. C. A. also sponsors credit unions among small wage earners.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman favor putting the Farm Credit Administration into the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the gentleman mean making the appropriation for that agency as a part of the agricultural appropriation?

Mr. GROSS. No; I mean putting the Farm Credit Administration under Secretary Wallace in the Department of Agriculture, whereas it is now a separate and independent lending agency.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would not want to commit myself on that just at this point.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman is discussing the benefits derived from the Farm Credit Administration, I thought he might be willing to express his opinion on that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yielded for a question only.

Mr. GROSS. I am only asking the gentleman a question. I hope the gentleman will answer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have said I do not feel I can answer the question at this time.

Loans to farmers

The farm credit service is available to all farmers who can qualify, regardless of race. Last year 8,167 Negro farmers in Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina borrowed \$1,798,934 through production credit associations under Farm Credit Administration supervision. These loans, averaging \$220.27 each, ranged from \$50 to \$5,000. Approximately 6 percent of the colored farmers in these States obtained loans.

More than 5,000 Negro farmers secured short-term loans in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. These represented about 20 percent of all such loans made in those States. Participating in the program, these colored farmers share in the ownership of \$1,033,000 of voting stock purchased by member-borrowers of production credit associations.

Farmers borrow from production credit associations for various purposes, such as the producing, harvesting, and marketing of crops; to finance the breeding, feeding, fattening, and marketing of livestock; and for the repair, improvement, or alteration of farm buildings. Security must be furnished for every type of loan. Farm Credit Administration officials report that Negro farmers repay their loans promptly and are considered among the best credit risks in the country.

Federal credit unions

In June 1940, records of the Farm Credit Administration showed that there were 48 Federal credit units organized among Negroes with a total membership of 4,178 persons. In addition, Negroes are members of certain credit unions serving other races. Forty-two of those unions reported loans

outstanding to members amounting to \$44,471. They had made a total of 3,731 loans totaling \$166,800. Their assets amounted to \$55,843.

Credit unions, sponsored by Farm Credit Administration, are located at such institutions as Howard University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee; Prairie View State College, Texas; Freedmen's Hospital, Washington; Stanley S. Holmes Village, public-housing project in Atlantic City; Veterans' Administration facilities, Tuskegee, Ala.; and University Homes, public housing project in Atlanta. School teachers, hospital attendants, and manual laborers are among members of Federal credit unions.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not yield.

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Negroes in America are still largely a rural people contributing importantly to the agricultural economics of the Southern States. The problems of the sharecropper, the tenant farmer, and the small-farm owner are problems confronting a considerable number of Negro families. To aid in the solution of these problems the Farm Security Administration was created by an act of Congress. The F. S. A. makes rehabilitation loans for 5-year periods at 5 percent interest. Through long-term loans repayable over a period of 40 years, it enables selected renters, sharecroppers, or farm laborers to become established as owners on desirable land. It seeks to develop better social and economic patterns in agriculture by establishing homestead projects. It establishes rental cooperatives and supplies without cost, a debt adjustment service available to all farmers.

Rehabilitation loans

These small loans enable the farmers to buy the things they need to make a living from the land—wagons, mules, milk cows, seed, fertilizer, and so forth. Farmers securing such loans cooperate with the F. S. A. farm and home management supervisors in carrying out plans for each year's operation. Approximately 50,000 such loans, representing 12.5 percent of the total, have been made to Negro farmers in the last 4 years. Negro farmers are 12.6 percent of America's farm operators.

Long-term land-purchase loans

Selected renters, sharecroppers, or farm laborers with energy, ambition, and good records may secure these loans for the purchase of desirable land. Cooperative supervision is stipulated in all such loan agreements. During the first year of operation, 1937-38, there were 265 such loans made to Negro farmers constituting 18.6 percent of the total for regions 4, 5, 6, and 8 where Negroes on farms are found in appreciable numbers. Applications for such loans steadily increase.

Homestead projects

In January 1940 nearly 1,800 Negro families were living in F. S. A. homestead projects in which effort is being made to develop better social and economic patterns in rural life. Some of these projects are new communities while others consist of scattered individual farms. Negro farmers are established on 31 projects in 13 States. Farmsteads are provided with dwellings, barns, and out buildings. Guidance is given to tenants of these projects by F. S. A. agents in cooperative farming.

Rental cooperatives

Through rental cooperatives, groups of tenants may improve their tenureship and living conditions by leasing large tracts of land through F. S. A. loans and operating these tracts cooperatively, usually with an option to buy within a given period. Thirty such rental cooperatives are being set up in the Mississippi Delta area. By January 1940 there were 427 Negro families living on 10 rental cooperatives. They constituted 47 percent of all families so located.

Economic and social services

Through the debt-adjustment service available to all farmers without cost, \$78,807,693 have been saved to American farmers during the past 4 years. Negro farmers have

shared in the benefits of this service. As a further service, F. S. A. offers loans to small groups of farmers unable to purchase livestock, heavy farm equipment, and other needed items individually, enabling them to purchase these for community use.

F. S. A. is shaping patterns in rural education by providing adequate school buildings and equipment on many projects and by stimulating the inclusion in courses of study of subjects carefully correlated with rural life. It supplies medical aid through the establishment of group medical care associations, through which members receive service of physicians and nurses at minimum rates.

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The National Youth Administration has insured the active integration and participation of Negroes in the program from the beginning. There are now 23 State supervisors of Negro activities in 23 State offices and approximately 500 or more project supervisors throughout the country. There are 65 Negro members on State advisory committees in 27 States, the District of Columbia, and New York City. In addition, there are 3 States with special State Negro committees. Local committees with Negro representation are established throughout the country in the planning of local Negro projects.

National Youth Administration employment figures

According to the 1930 census, Negroes represent 9.7 percent of the total population. Negro youth represent 10.9 percent of the youth between the ages of 15 and 24. In December 1939 it is estimated that approximately 78,300 Negro youth were employed on the student aid and work programs of the N. Y. A. out of a total employment of 708,000. This represents 11.1 percent Negro youth on the N. Y. A. program. Of this number, 41,500 are N. Y. A. school, college, and graduate students and 36,800 are employed on the work program.

Student aid

Under the 1939-40 college- and graduate-aid program, 113 Negro colleges received an allotment of \$420,420. A special Negro college- and graduate-aid fund of \$105,000 was also distributed to almost 650 college and graduate students who otherwise would not have been included in the regular college and graduate quotas. This makes a total of \$525,420 which went directly to Negro students within the N. Y. A. college- and graduate-aid program. In addition, Negro youth received student aid from the regular fund allotment in colleges open to both white and colored students. Of the 41,500 Negro student-aid recipients, 7,200 were receiving college and graduate aid.

An analysis was made this year of the approved student-aid applicants, at which time 5.9 percent of the total college- and graduate-aid applicants were Negro and 11.3 percent of the high-school applicants were Negro youth. In those Southern States where the Negro population is over 25 percent of the total population, the proportion of approved Negro applicants to the total applicants for student aid was approximately 29 percent.

The average family income of all school, college, and graduate Negro students was \$365. The average family income of the Negro high-school students was \$334 as compared with the average family income of \$664 of all school-aid recipients. Negro college students came from families with an average income of \$554 as compared with \$1,129 for the families of all college- and graduate-aid students on the program. Of the Negro student-aid recipients, 93 percent came from families receiving less than \$1,000 a year income; 64 percent came from families making less than \$500 a year.

Nearly 42 percent of the Negro school-aid recipients were members of families which had received some form of public relief or W. P. A. employment during the 5 years ending December 1938. Even more revealing is the fact that, according to a survey made last year, 55 percent of these students came from families whose livelihood is in the field of unskilled labor, domestic and personal service, and farming. In contrast, less than 8 percent came from professional, semiprofessional, and other white-collar groups.

Work projects

In March 1939 approximately 36,800 Negro youth were employed on N. Y. A. work projects, which is about 13 percent of the total project employment for that month. These Negro youth were employed on all types of projects. Many of the Southern States are emphasizing the repair and modernization of Negro schools and are building small rural schools for Negroes. For example, one State submitted applications to construct 9 school buildings and 1 children's home for Negroes. Another State submitted projects for 18 Negro schools, or other educational buildings, and 3 teachers homes.

Resident centers

There are 60 resident centers for Negro youth, with another three employing both white and colored youth. The planned capacity for the Negro resident projects is about 3,800.

These youth, drawn from nearby rural communities, are taught farming and industrial techniques, as well as home management. Boys earn their subsistence and tuition by work on the farm and in the shop, receiving related training in general farm shop work, soil conservation, rotation and diversification of crops and animal husbandry, auto mechanics, machine-shop practice, brickmasonry, printing, painting, and building construction. Girls work in cafeterias, kitchens, and dormitories with related training in the preparation of and serving of foods, home management, marketing, gardening, canning, sewing, personal hygiene, and laundry work.

Vocational guidance

Junior placement counselors are provided by the N. Y. A. to place young people in jobs and to supply applicants with information concerning job opportunities, training facilities, and in general to help young people to prepare themselves for employment. In a few cities these services are operated for Negro and white youth separately, but in most cities both Negro and white youth are eligible to register at the same office. In cooperation with the State employment services, the N. Y. A. has been responsible for the establishment of junior placement services in 142 cities of 41 States and the District of Columbia.

THE UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

The United States Housing Authority was established by an act of Congress to give financial assistance to local housing authorities in eliminating slums, developing safe, sound, and sanitary dwellings for low-income families living in substandard homes, and to reduce unemployment through stimulation of business activity.

Assistance to local authorities

The Government's public housing program is a decentralized program. Under terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the U. S. H. A. is authorized to grant loans to local housing authorities covering up to 90 percent of the development costs of projects and to grant annual subsidies for the purpose of keeping the rents within reach of low-income families. The initiation, development, operation, and management of the projects are in the hands of the local authorities. The U. S. H. A. acts as banker and offers technical and other assistance in the development of the projects.

Twenty-one cities in various sections of the country have appointed Negroes to the local housing authority, the policy-making body for the local program. In two States Negroes serve on the State housing board.

The development of projects

By February 1940 loan contracts between the U. S. H. A. and local housing authorities had received Presidential approval for the development of 134,056 dwelling units. These loans, totaling \$597,633,000, will defray 90 percent of the development costs of 362 projects in 162 different communities throughout the Nation.

According to current estimates, Negro families will occupy approximately 44,754, or about one-third, of the dwelling units already approved. These new projects have been planned for development in 116 communities in 25 States and the District of Columbia.

Of the 178 projects under construction by the middle of February 1940, 55 were for predominant Negro occupancy,

while plans provided for the inclusion of Negro tenants in 15 other projects then under construction. Negro tenants are now living in 7 of the 17 U. S. H. A. aided projects which have been opened for occupancy.

One of the larger U. S. H. A. aided projects is now under construction in Chicago's crowded South Side. This project, known as the Ida B. Wells Homes, will replace a slum area and provide decent new dwellings for 1,662 families. The project will consist of row houses, flats, and apartment buildings. There will be adequate recreational facilities and play spaces. When the project shall have been completed it will not only relieve congestion in that district but will represent the fruition of plans which were first projected in 1934 by the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration, at that time the Government's public housing agency.

This is the largest of the projects to be developed in a predominantly Negro urban area. However, U. S. H. A. aided projects are being developed in Negro neighborhoods in many small cities throughout the Nation as well as in such metropolitan centers as Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Atlanta, Cleveland, and St. Louis.

Employment

The development of these projects has meant jobs as well as homes for American workers. Some \$225,000,000 will be paid in wages to building-trades workers on the sites of projects. Millions more will be paid to employees engaged in the production, fabrication, and transportation of building materials. Negro workers are employed in all of these industries.

Under terms and conditions of contracts for the development of U. S. H. A. aided projects discrimination in employment because of race is forbidden. The contracts further stipulate minimum percentages for Negro labor, the fulfillment of which shall be considered evidence that such labor has not been discriminated against.

Already Negro building-trades workers currently employed in the construction of 141 U. S. H. A. aided projects in 84 cities have received \$2,126,000 in wages. This sum represents 10 percent of the total wages paid construction workers on these projects. Of the amount paid to Negro workers, \$464,000 went to skilled workers—Negro carpenters, masons, cement finishers, plasterers, and in some instances, as in Chicago, Negro electricians and steamfitters have been employed.

Employment, however, has not been confined to building-trades workers. Negro architects have been employed by local housing authorities to design projects in Charleston, W. Va., Baltimore, Washington, and Los Angeles. Negro engineers have supervised construction in Philadelphia and Chicago. Negro lawyers and real-estate men have been employed in land acquisition in Newark, Chicago, and Augusta, Ga. In many cities Negro social workers have been employed in tenant relocation and selection. In Pittsburgh and Newark Negro stenographic and clerical help have been employed in the central offices of the local housing authorities.

The management and maintenance of low-rent housing projects afford a new field of employment. Negro personnel has been selected for the management and maintenance of projects in Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Ohio, Wilmington, N. C., and Augusta, Ga.

Negroes are employed on the administrative staff of the U. S. H. A. in Washington. Professional and technical workers who have been employed by the U. S. H. A., include two lawyers, two architects, two engineers, and an accountant. These are in addition to the staff of the Office of Racial Relations and the stenographic and clerical help employed in other divisions of the U. S. H. A.

Housing Division P. W. A.

The Government's public housing program was originally launched by the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration and was taken over by the U. S. H. A. after its creation by the United States Housing Act of 1937. Negro families now occupy 7,478 of the 21,317 dwellings developed under this earlier program. Sixteen of the forty-nine projects are occupied predominantly by Negro families and are man-

aged and maintained by Negro staffs. Negroes also are among the tenants of 14 other of these projects, some of which include Negro personnel on their management and maintenance staffs.

Likewise Negro construction workers shared in the wages paid for the development of these projects. Negro building-trades workers employed in the construction of 33 P. W. A. low-rent housing projects in 21 cities received \$3,115,695.86, or 15.36 percent of the total wages paid construction workers on these projects. Negro skilled workers received \$774,437.11, or 5.51 percent of wages paid to skilled workers.

OTHER NEW FEDERAL AGENCIES

Negroes in large numbers have likewise benefited directly and indirectly from other agencies which have been established by acts of Congress since 1933.

Social Security Board

Chief among these agencies is the Social Security Board. Thousands of Negroes employed in mechanical and industrial occupations are eligible to receive unemployment benefits and will be entitled to old age and survivors' benefits. The Social Security Board contributes to the States in providing assistance to dependent children, widowed mothers, the blind and aged persons not covered by old age and survivors' insurance.

Two branch offices of the Social Security Board located in the Negro districts of New York and Chicago are staffed by Negro managers and workers. Other Negroes are employed in unemployment insurance offices in such States as New York, Ohio, North Carolina, Michigan, and Illinois. Their salaries are paid in part by the States and in part by the Federal Government.

Tennessee Valley Authority—Rural Electrification Administration

Thousands of Negroes residing in the Tennessee Valley are profiting from the cheaper electricity rates made available to them by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Rural Electrification Administration has likewise made farm life less dreary and burdensome through bringing electricity to the farmstead.

Home Owners Loan Corporation—Federal Housing Administration

The Negro home owner and prospective home owner have been assisted by the Home Owners Loan Corporation in retaining their homes and by the Federal Housing Administration in purchasing new homes on easy terms.

National Labor Relations Board—Wage and Hour Act

Negro labor has been protected in the right to bargain collectively by the provisions of the National Labor Relations Board and has benefited by the minimum wages and maximum hours provided by the Wage and Hour Act in such industries as tobacco, transportation, and lumber.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE NEW DEAL

There has been a considerable amount of criticism voiced of late to the effect that the New Deal agencies have been operated so as to extend the areas of racial discrimination. In evaluating such criticism, it may be well to follow the lead of Al Smith and "let's have a look at the record."

In the so-called Hatch Act adopted by the present predominantly Democratic Congress, there appears in section 4 the following statement:

It shall be unlawful for any person, of any employment, position, work, compensation, or any benefits provided or made possible by any act of Congress appropriating funds for work relief or relief purposes, on account of race, creed, color, or any political activity, support of, or opposition to, any candidate or any political party in any election.

This constitutes one of the first instances on record where the Congress, by general legislation, has specifically proscribed racial discrimination in the expenditure of funds.

Following out this injunction the Public Resolution No. 24, adopted by the Seventy-sixth Congress, which makes appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, states in section 28 that—

Any person * * * who knowingly by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to

which he may be entitled under any such appropriations * * * shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years or both.

In section 30 (b) this joint resolution repeats the language of section 4 of the Hatch Act, quoted above, prohibiting discrimination on account of race. This resolution affects the entire W. P. A. relief and work-relief program.

In the case of non-Federal grants by the P. W. A. an agreement is entered into by the public body that received the funds, and the Public Works Administration. This agreement requires specifically that there shall be no discrimination in the selection of workmen for the project. This requirement is stated in part 4 of the construction terms and conditions, as follows:

The applicant will require that there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, or political affiliation in the employment of persons for work on the project.

Much more decisive action has been taken by P. W. A. in instances where Federal projects are undertaken. This stipulation took the form of a prima facie nondiscrimination clause. It was required that in the employment of labor under the contracts Negroes be employed in certain proportions, such proportions to be determined by the 1930 occupational census figures.

The United States Housing Authority, in taking over the work of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration, has actively carried forward and enforced this protection of Negro skilled and unskilled labor. The general terms and conditions for U. S. H. A. aided projects includes the following injunction:

The local authority will require that there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, or political affiliations in the employment of persons for work on U. S. H. A. aided projects. In order to give effect to this requirement, insofar as it may affect Negro employees on construction, the local authority shall insert in all construction contracts a provision that payment to Negro skilled and unskilled labor of certain percentages of the amount paid under the contract for such labor shall be considered prima facie evidence that the contractor has not discriminated against Negro labor. The percentages to be used are those of Negro skilled and unskilled building construction laborers employed in the particular city as reflected by the last national census.

Under the operation of this clause, Negro labor at the end of the year 1939 had already received a total of well over a million dollars.

The U. S. H. A. goes even further in the protection of minority groups. In its policy bulletin on site selection there appears the following statement of policy:

Particular care should be exercised in site selection to safeguard the interests of minority groups which may be affected. Although it is the responsibility of the local housing authority to decide its own racial policy, certain desirable principles may be suggested for application in this connection. Some of these may be enumerated as follows: (1) The development of public housing projects for white occupancy in areas now occupied by Negroes or other minority racial groups is undesirable. * * * (2) Whenever exceptions are to be made to this general policy, the local authority should demonstrate the circumstances which it believes justify the exception, and there should be obtained, if possible, a statement of concurrence in the program from representative spokesmen of the racial groups to be displaced. (3) Any local program which involves the demolition of a number of houses available to minority racial groups which is considerably greater than the total to be provided for these groups in the new project is undesirable. * * * (4) If it is decided to develop sites which are either inhabited now by members of more than one race or, in the case of vacant sites, are contiguous to neighborhoods which are inhabited by different races, local authorities should plan projects open to the members of these different groups.

The National Youth Administration has taken definite steps in its written policy to protect Negroes in the extension of its benefits. In section 2, part 2, of its Manual on Student Aid Procedure, the Administrator directs that—

In assigning quotas, distribution of school-aid funds to provide assistance to young men and women of any minority racial group shall not represent a smaller proportion of the total State school-aid-fund quota than the ratio which this racial group bears to the total population of the school district or State.

In addition, the N. Y. A. has set aside a special fund in order that needy Negro college and graduate students may be reached by the benefits.

Eligible Negro students—

States the Student Aid Bulletin—

who cannot be cared for within a particular institution's quota for student aid, after it has made a fair allocation for Negro students from its regular quota, may apply for assistance from the special Negro college- and graduate-aid fund through the institution they desire to attend. Such institutions may then apply through the office of the State youth administration to the Washington office of the N. Y. A. for an additional sum for Negro college and graduate aid.

This special fund takes cognizance of the fact that in a large number of Southern States inadequate facilities for college and graduate study are now available to Negro students at public institutions.

In one Southern State which affords most inadequate high-school facilities for Negro pupils, it was found that it was impossible for N. Y. A. benefits to apply to a number of eligible Negro high-school students since there were no high schools for them to attend. The N. Y. A. met this situation by transferring almost \$17,000 from the regular school aid funds designated for high-school students to the college and graduate aid fund for Negroes in that State in order to make possible the setting up of rural teacher-training units in six of the available high schools. These funds made it possible to train as "post graduate" high-school students close to 200 Negro teachers for the small rural schools of the State.

These policies were further implemented in such agencies as the W. P. A., N. Y. A., P. W. A., and U. S. H. A. by the presence in all of these New Deal agencies of Negro administrative staffs who were in position to do two things: First, to provide during the initiation and formulation of the program definite devices for the protection of Negro participants, and second, to keep track of the extent of racial participation in order to make possible their equitable sharing in the benefits, and to keep their entire organizations alert to guard against racial discrimination in the operation of these agencies. These various administrative devices and statements of policy under the New Deal agencies represent progressive steps made by the Federal Government in the protection of minority racial groups and in making it possible that these groups participate equitably in Federal programs.

What I have said shows that under this administration millions of Negroes at the bottom of the economic ladder have not only been helped, but have been kept alive. No administration at any time has ever shown half the interest in this group of citizens that the New Deal administration has shown.

You will note that I have said nothing about the high positions which Negroes have held under this administration. The fact is that aside from the millions of common people who have been helped, a larger number of the group have been recognized and appointed to responsible positions high up in the Government than in any previous administration.

In this connection, let me mention a few of them: Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, N. Y. A. Director; Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Assistant Housing Administrator; Dr. William J. Thompson, recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia; Lt. Lawrence Oxley, special assistant in the Department of Labor; and many other men and women of high rank have been appointed to outstanding positions with salaries ranging from \$2,500 to \$10,000. Lester Walton, Minister to Liberia, receives \$10,000; Armond W. Scott, judge of municipal court for the District of Columbia, receives \$8,000; Hon. William L. Houston was appointed special assistant in the Department of Justice. The first Negro Federal judge appointed outside of the District of Columbia, Judge William Hastie, was appointed by this administration. Judge Hastie served for several years in the Virgin Islands; when he resigned the the judgeship, Judge Herman Moore, a Negro from Chicago, was appointed to succeed him and is now serving on the Federal bench in the Virgin Islands. But this administration, unlike all previous administrations, has helped millions in the lower brackets, while heretofore Republican administrations have helped a few outstanding persons, appointing them to key positions presumably for the purpose of satisfying the race. Through the New Deal administration this policy has been reversed, and the way has been opened for the Negro to take a firm stand and begin a definite and successful march

toward real prosperity and equal opportunity and recognition in this country.

What then has the Negro to quarrel about insofar as this administration is concerned? There may be other groups who think they have some justification to complain about what they have received under the New Deal administration. The Negroes can have no such claim. Every well-thinking Negro in the United States today, if he is honest with himself, must confess that this administration has brought to the Negro his best opportunity and has created in him the strongest hope that he has witnessed during his days of freedom. Let the Negro go forward with serious thoughts about his welfare and future and in his heart show the gratitude which he feels toward those who have given him this great opportunity for which he has prayed and worked during the past 50 years. The record of New Deal achievement in our behalf has been made. It cannot be changed even by the few designing persons who would like to do so for selfish motives.

The President, his splendid wife, and the outstanding members of his Cabinet have all shown unusual interest in the welfare of the Negro. I know not what course others may take in the coming campaign, but I know for the best interests of the Negro, a third term by Franklin Delano Roosevelt would mean continued progress for the Negro. Personally, it is my desire to see the President serve a third term. If for any reason he cannot be persuaded to serve a third term, it is my opinion that he and the large number of forward looking statesmen in the Democratic ranks will see that the nomination goes to another genuine New Dealer who will carry forward the splendid work which this administration has so well begun. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore made the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is entitled to be recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to let the gentleman from New York speak at this time, inasmuch as he is asking for only 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] while he was speaking if he would yield for a question. I wanted to ask him how many colored people are unemployed in the United States, and if there is not a far larger number of unemployed in the colored group in proportion to population than in any other group in America after 7 years of the New Deal; also, if it is not true that the colored people have suffered more under the New Deal because of unemployment than any other single group. I am convinced that there have been more unemployed Negroes during the past 7 years than ever before in our history.

I also should have liked to ask the gentleman who has just spoken how many colored men in America have been appointed to high offices under the New Deal, whether any colored men have been appointed to high official office in the southern States, and what colored men have been appointed to important offices in States north of the Mason and Dixon's line. Under Republican administrations the colored people did receive important appointments in Washington and in the South as well as in the North.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] to yield because I wanted to ask him a question, and if the gentleman will permit I will ask him to answer that question because the gentleman from Illinois refused to yield. The gentleman from Illinois boasted about the virtues of the New Deal as they affect

the people of the colored race in America. I wanted to ask him whether he realizes that below the Mason and Dixon's line, which is in complete control of the New Deal, they drive the colored people away from the polls and will not even let them vote? They also make our colored people ride in Jim Crow cars and patronize colored restaurants, hotels, theaters, and so forth, and prohibit them from patronizing ones which are patronized by the people of the white race.

Mr. FISH. I also wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois, if he had yielded, where the President of the United States stands on the antilynching bill. We know where the President of the United States stands on all racial and religious questions in foreign lands, but we should like to know where he stands on enacting an antilynching bill at the present time in the United States of America. He has been strangely silent about that, a matter which vitally affects the security of some 13,000,000 colored people in America. One word from the White House and that bill would come flying through the Senate and be enacted into law. Day after day we hear about President Roosevelt's views affecting foreign lands, but when it comes to making democracy safe in America and safe for 13,000,000 colored people, he is strangely silent. The White House continues to be as silent as a tomb when the colored people ask for an endorsement of the Gavigan-Fish antilynching bill.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] speaks about all these different agencies of the Government I would like to have him put in the RECORD how many colored people hold important jobs in these different agencies or bureaucracies of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman, although the gentleman would not yield to me when making his lengthy speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will say to the gentleman that that is in the RECORD and in my speech. I asked permission at the very beginning to extend my remarks because I knew the speech would be too long to bring it within the time allotted to me, but that will be found answered in the speech.

Mr. FISH. That is what I want. I want the facts and not campaign speeches for home consumption.

The gentleman from Illinois was speaking about these different agencies of the Government and what they are doing for the colored people, but is it not true that most of these buildings for the colored people are segregated? They are segregated for a certain group of people in America. Does the gentleman from Illinois believe in segregation?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to preface my answer by saying that this administration has refused to follow the example that the Republican Party has set, and we have a great many of these units that are mixed, such as the Republican Party has never given us.

Mr. FISH. Where are those mixed units?

Mr. MITCHELL. One of them in Chicago.

Mr. FISH. And they divide them 50-50?

Mr. MITCHELL. No; not exactly 50-50, because we are not half of the population; we are one-tenth of the population.

Mr. FISH. But the gentleman is also advocating these segregated units, is he not?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not advocating anything. I am talking from the record about what this administration has done. I am not trying to become President and I have no agitation to start.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman will take the trouble to answer the question he would not yield to answer, and that is with respect to how many colored people in America are unemployed at the present time. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman knows that is an impossibility, because the gentleman does not know how many

are unemployed in the city of New York. That has not been determined and we have not the exact figures. The gentleman is asking the impossible, and I should like to observe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is an adept in asking the impossible. I will say to the gentleman that the number of colored people unemployed at this time is not half as large as it was in 1932 when his party was in power.

Mr. FISH. That is the question and I did not think the gentleman would be competent to answer it and, evidently, he is not. The New Deal has made abundant promises to the Negroes but about all they have received is more abundant debts, deficits, and unemployment. They want permanent jobs to provide adequately for their families and not relief at 50 cents a day. The New Deal for 7 lean years has failed to give them permanent jobs and the only way I know of for them to once again become employed at American standard of wages and living is through the election of a Republican President. The gentleman has made a speech about the unemployment among the colored people and yet does not know how many are unemployed. That is the most important political and economic issue confronting his group. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in calling the Private Calendar on tomorrow, the omnibus claims bills be called first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the little speech I am about to make at this time is twofold.

First. To help us, as lawmakers, to get away from that partisanship to which it seems a majority are in some measure inclined.

Second. To study how to approach the subject of being an individual Congressman in Washington. There are many here who could make a better speech on the subject than I, but they have not done so; therefore I represent myself as stepping away from partisan behavior, believe it or not, and contributing my bit to this forum as an unbiased, broad-aimed, nonpartisan lawmaker elected to represent the people, and the whole people, of his district, and one who may, if and when the opportunity arises, put in a little plug for his whole country.

Perhaps one who has been here precisely the length of time I have is in the better position to handle this subject, having been here long enough to begin to get the congressional slant, and yet not for time enough to be entirely lost from that out-of-Congress, lay view that our 2-year-term set-up evidently seeks to preserve. The most earnest lecture the college freshman receives comes from the sophomore, the junior and senior have become too grown up, and besides, have other jobs to do; so it is with our station here. One who is only one notch removed will step forth and gladly hold out his lamp of experience. The two branches of purpose in this speech are really related, and, as is often true of kinfolks, that is why they are found here together. The first is the partisan bias, which is easily recognized as egocentric in its origin. A Congressman comes in here newly elected and mantled with a brand new authority booted and spurred by gifts of confidence from whatever political party gave his name the life, the required boost, that placed him high enough to strike out for Congress. So he comes here an heir to party enthusiasm. This alone is natural, healthy, and proper, of course, but did you ever see the swelling and inspired patriot breeze into Congress fresh and green from his home town with a new vision, a new commission, and a new necktie, a gleam in his eye, a well-worded, high-sounding speech in his mouth, feeling fully

qualified to shed any light needed on any subject arising, whether or not connected with any committee with which he is connected—and scarcely has he warmed his seat—his seat in Congress, till the lightning speed of his expanding scope is such that he announces as a candidate for the Senate of the United States. Oh, mores; oh, tempora. Personally I have doubts as to its being any advantage or promotion to go from this body to the Senate.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to remark, so it may appear as a part of the gentleman's remarks, that the infant mortality here is very, very high.

Mr. PATRICK. I understand so, and I thank the gentleman for his excellent and timely contribution.

It is the House group under whose wise guidance that all revenue laws must arise. Each Member of the House must get a renewed letter of authority from Mr. and Mrs. America each 2 years; indeed, in the event of a vacancy the Governor may appoint a Senator, but not a Congressman; a Congressman must come out of the maw of democracy free, unshackled and unobligated.

Senators may by Governor be made,
By push and pull, an' a' that,
But Congress stands above the grade
The Governor must fa' that.

I do not suppose this is close enough to Bobby Burns to require an apology, but these gentlemen who come in with the feeling that they are specially endowed with the gifts of extreme wisdom, perspicacity, and foresight often, for all their greatness, appear pitiful partisans—well, Bobby Burns does have a word for them:

O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as ithers see us,
It wad from mony a blunder free us
And foolish notion.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I shall yield later.

Mr. TREADWAY. But I want to make a correction of what the gentleman has said.

Mr. PATRICK. I always yield for a correction.

Mr. TREADWAY. There are some States—and I am positive about one State—where the Governor has no constitutional authority in the State to make the appointment of a Senator.

Mr. PATRICK. That is true in some States, I understand, but I am talking about the matter as a general proposition. My purpose is to show that a Senator is in no true measure superior to a Congressman.

The Members who have been here for many terms, mellowed by the years, do not generally reflect this partisan slant. I am tempted to suggest the name of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]—others, of course. To be sure, every Member of this body is a patriotic, sincere American, but most certainly we can be sincere and can be as earnest as is in us as individuals to be without childish feeling that those of the other major party are not proceeding for a fair and true conviction and because one is not a member of our party; is following some ulterior motive, or that his whole song is pitched on a false note. One thing we young ones must try to learn, and that is that we may be green without being fresh and may be serious without being audacious.

A few days ago the worthy gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and I had a friendly exchange of mutual respects upon the floor of the House, all in the best of humor, in which I made reference to never having seen him smile. Oh, it is not important, of course, as to whether the gentleman can find a smile in some old story of mine—incidentally I seldom indulge in story telling on the floor; however, whether I do or not is of no moment—but he should be able to get a smile from the keen and flashing wit of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]; the clever observations of the gentleman

from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON], or the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS; or the pointed and effective parries of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. However, I did the gentleman from Wisconsin wrong. It has been called to my attention by a Congressman from his own State that when he himself tells a story he not only smiles but laughs out in great glee, all of which is beside the point; and perish the thought that anyone should charge the esteemed gentleman from Wisconsin with having the qualities I have been referring to, but as one friend to another—one coworker to another—I do recommend to his observation the behavior of men who have been here for years, Democrats and Republicans, wise men, intelligent, and rich in the golden experience of legislation gathered in this very Hall who are also modest and retiring and who sit in counsel in this forum, day in and day out, to listen without the urge bringing them up to air their views of any subject coming before this body. It can do him no harm to observe them.

But enough of that. We—everyone in this body, approximately 435 of us—cannot we take our jobs seriously without taking ourselves so, and can we not think of what we have to do here rather than of the party which will get the credit in the event it turns out well? It seems so foolish for any Republican to assume that most any bill brought in is subject to suspicion because it was presented by Democrats, and Democrats appear foolish who ascribe each objection arising over there as directed at a measure on a partisan bias. Cannot we transcend all that, get away from it, and get to the complex job of being a Congressman in Washington, a Washington Congressman, here for the purpose of serving those who sent us, those who voted for us as well as those who had the foresight and vision to vote against us?

Now, that is getting to be a real job of this land of 130,000,000. Kindly oblige me and yourself for a moment by reviewing a few of the things that a Congressman undertakes to do when he lands in Washington as a district's Representative. There are now on file in the Congress of the United States 13,942 live bills, and bills still coming in.

We have bills to revise the calendar, bills to authorize the President to proclaim a day of fasting and prayer, bills for anniversary celebrations, bills to change the height-and-weight regulations for men in the Army, Navy, and marines, bills for Nation-wide marriage laws, Nation-wide divorce laws, bills to provide rotation of daylight saving, to take over relics of Christopher Columbus, a bill to provide for the employment of every person in the United States, a bill for the protection of the bald eagle, a bill to abolish chain-gang systems, a bill to send all Negroes out of the United States—and this is to mention only a slight few.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Briefly.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would like to suggest one other subject.

Mr. PATRICK. Very well; let us have it.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have been thinking to offer a bill to curb the matrimonial activities of hospital nurses. Would the gentleman advocate that?

Mr. PATRICK. I have not studied it, but I think it would be a delightful subject to study.

But your swelling daily job is to attend the demands of a neat percent of the some of 400,000 persons who are chalked up as your constituents. Our Government has announced itself in recent years, and no doubt properly so, as being of and for the people—and are they responding? They are responding, and in doing so they are traveling the congressional route. So, whether the Democrats, Republicans, Farm-Laborites, or Marcantonioites send us, examples of what a man and even a woman is expected to do here in Washington representing a congressional district, one of the 435 for the whole Nation, make a sincere study. I have assembled 10 simple rules for the use of the Members of Congress which I intend to mail to each of them. I hope you will find these useful in and about your daily chores. I shall now read these 10 rules:

RULES FOR A CONGRESSMAN IN WASHINGTON

1. Entertain with a smile constituents, their wives, their sons, sons' wives, etc. Go with them to the White House; show good reason why you are unable to personally have them meet the President; take daughters to meet midshipmen at Annapolis.

2. Explain what bill is up for debate; point for discussion; how it will be passed; how you will vote and why.

3. Attend to balcony and point out Speaker BANKHEAD, Leaders RAYBURN and MARTIN, HAM FISH, DEWEY SHORT, that man MARTIN DIES, and name each lady Member of Congress.

4. Respond to worthy causes; make afterdinner speeches, before-dinner speeches; learn to eat anything, anywhere, any night—work all day, dictate all night, and be fresh as a rain-washed daisy for next day's duties.

5. Be a cultured gentleman, a teller of ribald stories, a profound philosopher, preserve a store of "Confucius say" gags; be a ladies' man, a man's man, a he-man, a diplomat, a Democrat with a Republican slant, a Republican with a Democrat viewpoint, and admirer of the Roosevelt way, a hater of the New Deal, a new dealer, an old dealer, and a quick dealer.

6. Learn how to attend six to eight major functions, rushing home and back during each term on one round-trip travel pay.

7. Have the dope on hot spots in town, with choice telephone numbers for the gay boys from back home, and help to contact all local moral organizations and uplift societies in Washington.

8. Learn to be expert guide. Keep car in tip-top shape.

9. Know names and dates related to all points of interest, and be able to explain and supply information regarding public buildings and statuary about Washington.

10. Be an authority on history, travel, psychology, philosophy, education, economics, civics, finance, export trade, Government printing, international relations, neckties, and fishing tackle.

Understand, I do not claim to come up to it all, especially as to telephone numbers, hot spots, stories, and so forth.

A Congressman has become an expanded messenger boy, and employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, marines, ward healer, wound healer, trouble shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, glad-hand extender, business promoter, convention kooze, civic ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-service man's champion, watchdog for the under dog, sympathizer with the upper dog, namer of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates, adjuster for traffic violators, voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law, binder up of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good Samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener—to be sure he does get in a little flag waving—and a little constitutional hoisting and spread-eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation—the very business we are primarily here to discharge and that must be done above all things. To go on would not help a lot. We are running our legs off on details but we must keep the approval of Mr. and Mrs. Voter, so we find here a subject upon which we can all agree; and regardless of these labors involved I for one prefer it to any job I have ever had and do not expect to relinquish it without a powerful fight. I hope I am here to stay many, I trust, useful years.

Now, one and all, do you not agree that it is much better for us to come here and study how we may best do the job that is expected of us, for the people who expect it, than to be here in Washington wigwagging the old, old bipartisan seesaw that has been bobbing up and down for a hundred and fifty years in practically the same spot?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; gladly.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am extremely anxious to know who this Uncle Sam is that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. PATRICK. There are 130,000,000 people in the United States—

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, that is an answer to my question.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GIFFORD. Therefore they are our neighbors, and I suppose they should know all about our business, and all about our income, and our privies and everything else. Our neighbors are Uncle Sam?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And they must know. I congratulate the gentleman that he answered so promptly that Uncle Sam is

simply our neighbors, who should stick their noses into our business.

Mr. PATRICK. As a matter of fact, when we apply that to 130,000,000 people, that is a study by themselves about themselves, and it is not merely our neighbors at all, it is us, it is me, finding out about myself, so I should know what to do about myself and what ought to be done by myself for myself. Now, move it back into the Nation, as a unit, and you have the reason it appeals to one's statesmanship.

Statesmanship is an engaging subject of study, as entrancing as an old maid's dream, taking as many and varied shapes as a drifting summer's cloud. Now let me confess that my place is merely that among the humble politician group, and I am as yet unable to claim membership among the lofty body of statesmen, but I do delight to watch them work. A shining example of a special brand of statesmanship is recently being exhibited by the banker-manufacturer, ex-Governor of New Hampshire, who, of course, knows what he wants and chooses the star he would follow, but for one in my modest station, I would never select for my brand of statesmanship a quality at which any fishwife should be my equal and the average soap-boxer my superior. Perhaps this suggests the subject of the census.

Our beloved Uncle Samuel has been counting noses and so on trying to see how many eggs he has in his basket at the beginning of each decade since 1790—I believe it was begun that year. Now I am unable to find wherein it has been called bureaucratic snooping until this go-round. I do not wish to let my own partisanship color my convictions, but while it is true our good old Uncle has added a few questions to his list each time it has always impressed most of us as only an honest and worthy effort to find what is going on around here, in the hope he may know better what to do about it. Mr. Average Citizen is demanding more at the hands of his Government year by year, and it does seem only logical that the more our gentle Uncle can know about him the better he should be able to make out. He is merely going about the business of finding out about his people, homes, farms, businesses, mines, factories, and so forth, about all of which he can scarcely be too sincerely interested—and this information must largely serve as his working data for 10 years to come. Regardless of which political party is in the saddle presently, this seems to some of us to be a very good idea. I have examined all the questions on the list and am unable to find any that should do personal harm to one who is only trying to conduct his affairs on the level and do right by everybody. I get sort of leery of these folks who rear up and become too sensitive and touchy about matters that in the general course of things would not appear objectionable. Lord knows there are no questions in the list I should mind answering to my Government. True, it is the greatest research job ever undertaken, but as an American I was all cocked and primed to be very proud of it till some of our statesmen commenced to shout "improper snooping," and I got kind of scared and commenced looking around to see what could be the matter. Well, the study is made. Now, I have settled back happy and undisturbed, because I think somebody is hollering "wolf" when no wolf is in sight that has not been grazing upon the hillside in plain view for some years—since 1932 at least.

You see, there is quite a little bit of stuff to be looked into. Uncle Samuel is held to a pretty high degree of responsibility regarding his lay-out of 7,000,000 farms, many of them washing away each year, 12,000 mines and quarries, 35,000,000 residence units, over 3,000,000 business concerns, over 170,000 manufacturing outfits, hogs, horses, cows, crops, automobiles, furniture, debts, births, and so on, and he feels that he should have as much of the needed information on all of it as he can get. As a matter of fact, the people have been so well warmed up with Literary Digest polls, Gallup polls, local chamber of commerce polls, newspaper polls, furniture dealers' polls, polls of radio listeners, and all, that we thought the folks would have most of the material added, on cards here and there, ready for the census taker on arrival. The Republicans asked

"How much rent do you pay?" in 1930, and we Democrats never then got hot under the collar. In 1850, '60, and '70 the American citizen was asked detailed information about his finances, and he responded nobly and told Uncle Sam the facts—and then, behold, it was very good. Our President ventured the estimate that our Nation is ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed, and Uncle Sam would like to know how near his Chief Executive came to the facts, if he may have the facts.

So while we are trying to do the job of being a Congressman in Washington let us not get so partisan that we may be just a little bit inclined to go off too far on matters that tend to get people back home to thinking things exist that do not quite bulk into such proportions. We might get folks excited over things that do not exist, and it might possibly give a bit of trouble in years to come, where it should not, and might bob up when and where least expected, and, certainly, where least wanted, for, after all, this is about substance that has little or nothing, in the last measure, to do with parties or party lines.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the handsome gentleman from Wisconsin, who sheds so much light constantly upon the doings of the House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. About this snooping by Uncle Sam. In view of the facts developed by the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], I would like to know whether that snooping is a part of the friendly neighbor policy of the New Deal?

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, no; we are just neighbors as between one another, having to do with things amongst ourselves. We are talking about ourselves now, and if any of the nations to the south of us should ask similar questions, we might tell them to go and jump into some friendly lake in South America. This census is nothing except us trying to find out something about ourselves. I think one of the biggest mistakes that we can make is to take ourselves as one group here and another group over there and then some other group. As a matter of fact, we are all one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT) for the week of March 18, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on farm imports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INDIAN ROCK DAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] speaking on farm credits. I wanted him to state his position on placing the Farm Credit Administration in the Department of Agriculture. I wish he would acquaint himself with the fact that that means regimentation of agriculture, and that he would come out and take a stand on it.

I noticed in a news release of the National Economy League that the national debt is now pushed beyond \$48,000,000,000. This would not be so if the Federal Government, in its various departments and projects, would apply better business methods. In the construction of the Indian Rock

Dam, which is a part of a flood-control project in Pennsylvania, in my county, York County, much money could be saved if the material purchased for the project had been obtained locally instead of being shipped in.

One of the objects of most of these Federal projects has been to supply labor for people out of jobs as well as to stimulate industry and I would like to know why labor and industry in the area of the project should not be recognized. Within a few miles of this dam all the products involved, except steel, could have been purchased. Also within a few miles of the dam we have one of the largest cement-producing mills in the eastern United States. If we check with the laboratory reports of the Pennsylvania Highway Department we will find that the limestone in the area has an unusually high cement content. The local sand meets with the specifications for this type of construction. It has long been established that limestone and sand produce a much better grade of concrete than river sand and gravel.

Quarries nearby have an investment of \$500,000 and employ over 100 men with an average weekly wage of \$25. Thus we find this community suffering a total loss in labor wages alone for stone and sand that could have been used in the construction of this dam totaling \$22,500. Fifty thousand tons of stone and sand are going to be used at the dam. The low bid for the stone was \$1.20 per ton f. o. b. job. That is \$1 for stone and 20 cents per ton trucking 4 miles to the job. The low bid for imported gravel was \$1.17 per ton f. o. b. job; car siding 62 cents for gravel and 55 cents for freight. There are to be used 40,000 barrels of cement, that is 200 carloads of about 200 barrels per car. The freight from the local plant to the job is \$16 per car. From the Penn-Dixie plant it will be \$98 per car. The Medusa plant, with an investment of over \$2,000,000, employs 200 men who will suffer a labor loss of \$12,000.

At a rate of 55 cents per ton for stone and sand the railroad will take a total of \$27,500 for freight which should go to the 150 local dump truckers of whom 90 percent are owner operated. The difference between \$16 and \$98 per car for 200 cars of cement is simply wasted money. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

JAMES ROOSEVELT

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall take this time to read into the Record two exceptionally fine editorials from two of our Wisconsin newspapers. I now read an editorial from the Shawano County Journal of March 14, 1940:

AGAIN—JIMMY GOT IT

Jimmy Roosevelt's papa had William G. McAdoo appointed to the \$25,000 job as head of the American President Steamship Line. And Mr. McAdoo had the line give its insurance business to Jimmy's firm, Roosevelt & Sargent, Inc.

If you were to ask Jimmy's papa why he selected Mr. McAdoo, he might say that he considered "Mac" the best of all possible shipping operators. Maybe he is. Certainly he was a man of large experience in other affairs—for instance, he had been a promoter, a corporation lawyer, a Secretary of the Treasury, and had boarded the Roosevelt band wagon at Chicago at precisely the right moment.

If you were to ask Mr. McAdoo why he gave the insurance account to Jimmy's firm he might say that Jimmy's firm writes the best of all possible insurance policies. It must be a good policy to make Mr. McAdoo, whose headquarters are in Chicago, go all the way to Boston, headquarters of Roosevelt & Sargent, Inc.

Of course, this is none of our business, except for some slight indirect interest deriving from the fact that we are citizens and taxpayers and the United States Government owns 90 percent of the common stock of this shipping company and the R. F. C. lent it \$4,500,000 and the United States Maritime Commission gave it a subsidy of \$3,000,000.

And, of course, there is nothing illegal about it. It's only a question of taste—and smell.

I shall now read an editorial from the Wausau Record-Herald of March 14, 1940:

NEW ROOSEVELT ENTERPRISE

With stories of his \$150,000 divorce settlement still in the news, James Roosevelt, eldest son of the President, dropped into Chicago a few days ago for a series of conferences with his new business partner, Fred L. Mills. Jimmy has jumped from the insurance frying pan into the fire of the tavern slot-machine business. He's still interested, however, in Roosevelt & Sargent, the insurance firm which recently got a big chunk of marine insurance from the United States Line of steamships, to the presidency of which, worth \$25,000 a year, his father appointed William G. McAdoo when the latter was defeated for reelection to the Senate.

While the President talks in toplofty terms about "economic royalists," Jimmy keeps an eye out for the main chance, even to grubbing for slot-machine nickels in taverns, drug stores, and filling stations. And Mrs. Roosevelt continues her lucrative lecture tours and her strange newspaper column, My Day. The name and the White House connection make good selling points for both.

The Mills slot-machine connections may prove rich. It's a big business, if occasionally dealing with shady layers of society, and Jimmy is supposed to have contracted with Mills to make a weekly short film for the slot-machine trade. It's the old penny-arcade racket elevated to nickel responsibility. Jimmy may have something there, although investors may ruefully recall his father's venture in the slot-machine vending business, the ill-fated Camco, a disastrous promotion which was F. D. R.'s only excursion into business. Jimmy seems to be a better businessman than his father.

Nevertheless, many will recall the days when a White House family respected Presidential dignity and prestige. That's one of the many traditions shattered by the present incumbent which we can ill afford to lose.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, March 19, 1940:

H. R. 6136, to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; 34 U. S. C. 1122), so as to authorize an appropriation of \$50,000 annually to aid in the maintenance and support of marine schools.

H. R. 7094, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7870, to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, to include Astoria, Oreg.

H. R. 8612, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

Thursday, March 21, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, March 21, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bills providing for the establishment of marine hospitals: H. R. 2985 (GREEN), at Jacksonville, Fla.; H. R. 3214 (GEYER of California), at Los Angeles, Calif.; H. R. 3578 (CANNON of Florida), at Miami, Fla.; H. R. 3700 (PETERSON of Florida), State of Florida; H. R. 4427 (GREEN), State of Florida; H. R. 5577 (IZAC), at San Diego, Calif.; H. R. 6983 (WELCH), State of California.

Wednesday, March 27, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Wednesday, March 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bills providing for Government aid to

the lumber industry: H. R. 7463 (ANGELL) and H. R. 7505 (BOYKIN).

Tuesday, April 2, 1940:

H. R. 7169, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish additional boards of local inspectors in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Tuesday, April 9, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 9, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 7637, relative to liability of vessels in collision.

Tuesday, April 16, 1940:

H. R. 8475, to define "American fishery."

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold hearings Thursday, March 21, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on S. 2689, to amend section 33 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, relating to unlawful importation of copyrighted works.

The Committee on Patents will hold hearings Wednesday and Thursday, April 10 and 11, 1940, at 10:30 a. m. each day, on H. R. 8441, to afford greater protection to the purchaser of patent rights; H. R. 8442, to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; H. R. 8443, to give the Commissioner of Patents power to protect inventors by establishing adequate standards of professional conduct among attorneys; and H. R. 8444, to permit the assignee of an application for letters patent to make certain supplemental applications.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs on Tuesday, March 19, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 8239, creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold hearings Wednesday, March 20, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 470, to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of \$425,000 for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1940.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday next, March 20, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 5674, H. R. 6796, H. R. 7530, and H. R. 8937.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, March 20, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7749 (Lesinski) Private bill and reports from subcommittee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 20, 1940, for the consideration of H. R. 4582, to provide for the acquisition of certain property for public use in the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1940 BEGINNING MARCH 18, 1940, AT 01 A. M., DAILY

The hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to report an omnibus bill with authorizations of approximately one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars covering the principal regions of the country.

1. Monday, March 18: Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, has been requested to make a general statement with his recommendations covering a general flood-control bill and the projects that should be included in the bill. He, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, the assistants to the Chief of Engineers, the division engineers, and

the district engineers will be requested to submit additional statements as individual projects are considered and as desired by the committee.

2. Tuesday, March 19: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers, from New England, New York, and the Atlantic seaboard on all reported projects and pending bills.

3. Wednesday, March 20: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers, from the upper Ohio and tributaries, on additional authorizations for levees, flood walls, and reservoirs.

4. Thursday, March 21: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers, from the lower Ohio and tributaries, on additional authorizations for levees, flood walls, and reservoirs.

5. Friday, March 22: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers, for the upper Mississippi and tributaries, and Missouri River and tributaries.

6. Saturday, March 23: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects on the Arkansas River and tributaries.

7. Monday, March 25: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects on the White River and tributaries.

8. Tuesday, March 26: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in reports on rivers in Texas and the Southwest.

9. Wednesday, March 27: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the Los Angeles area and in the Pacific Northwest.

10. Thursday, March 28: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Colorado and other western areas.

11. Friday, March 29: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and other tributaries.

12. Saturday, March 30: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other drainage-basin areas for other projects in other parts of the country.

13. Monday, April 1: Senators and Members of Congress, Department of Agriculture, and other governmental agencies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1464. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1465. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a request for modification of the views expressed in letter of January 15 concerning the provision "that all personnel employed on such work and occupying skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, and supervisory positions shall be citizens of the United States"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1466. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1940 in the amount of \$1,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 663); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1467. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified volume comprising the acts of the second special session of the Fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 11 to 19, 1939; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 429. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Belle G. Schmoeyer,

widow of the late Harry A. Schmoyer (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 8423. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard," approved January 12, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Texas: Committee of conference. S. 1955. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate certain regulatory functions, and to create the position of Second Assistant Secretary of Agriculture (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8916. A bill to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2856. A bill for the relief of Nicola Mordegli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Isaac Surmany; without amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5640. A bill to admit Richard Paul Rehn permanently to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6946. A bill for the relief of Salvator Taras; without amendment (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7595. A bill for the relief of Eugene Gruen and his wife, Kate; without amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7800. A bill for the relief of Frank Walker and his mother, Sarah Ann Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7179. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Louis D. Friedman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 8830. A bill to amend the record at the port of New York to show the admission of Steve Zegura, Jr., and B. Dragomir Zegura as aliens admitted for permanent residence; without amendment (Rept. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2036. A bill for the relief of Umberto Tedeschi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2684. A bill for the relief of Emma Knutson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7046. A bill for the relief of Maria Schreyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7515. A bill for the relief of Joseph B. Rupinski and Maria Zofia Rupinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7814. A bill for the relief of Gerald Henry Simpson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5641. A bill to admit Johann Rudolf Hueneberg permanently to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6302. A bill for the relief of Michal Kaliskiewicz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2033. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Anselmo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7722) granting a pension to Roscoe Johnson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8827) for the relief of L. A. Holcombe; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 8954. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the George Washington Birthplace National Monument, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 8955. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control projects on Fall River, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8956 (by request). A bill to amend section 172 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 8957. A bill to provide for employment, for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardships and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 8958. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the county of Wayne, State of Michigan, an easement over certain land of the United States in Wayne County, Mich., for sewage-disposal line; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARTER of New York:

H. R. 8959. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8960. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 8961. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building at Natchez, Miss., to provide quarters for the post office and other governmental agencies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 8962. A bill to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 8963. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 8964. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 8965. A bill to reduce unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 8966. A bill authorizing appropriations for payments to counties supplemental to those authorized by the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 500; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Res. 430. Resolution for the relief of Elma S. Moulton; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 8967. A bill granting a pension to Amelia Niswender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 8968. A bill for the relief of Jennie M. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRIES:

H. R. 8969. A bill for the relief of C. H. Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 8970. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mara C. Lowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHENS:

H. R. 8971. A bill to authorize the appointment of Harry E. Cook, Jr., to the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 8972. A bill for the relief of W. T. Brannan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 8973. A bill granting a pension to Stella C. Eslinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 8974. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Mackowiac; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6977. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, with reference to migratory labor in agriculture; to the Committee on Labor.

6978. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of Nona Tubbs, of Pasadena, Calif., containing the signatures of 1,050 citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of California, urging the enactment of the General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6979. By Mr. JONES of Ohio: Petition of Charles K. Zimmerman, of Lima, Ohio, and 82 others; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6980. Also, petition of K. J. Heiser, of Sidney, Ohio, and 32 others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6981. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Reuel E. Root and 36 other residents of Coopersville, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of House Joint Resolution No.

228, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6982. Also, petition of Reuel E. Root and 37 other residents of Coopersville, Mich., protesting against the enactment of House bill 5732, a bill designating Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6983. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, New York City, concerning the alien and sedition bills, also the war referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6984. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, expressing opposition to the Townsend bill (S. 785) concerning silver purchases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6985. Also, petition of the Harbor Carriers of the Port of New York, New York City, concerning the importation of tropical refined sugar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6986. Also, petition of the National Woman's Party, New York City, concerning the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6987. Also, petition of the New York State Waterways Association, Inc., Albany, N. Y., concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, urging support of House Resolution 360, which provides for an investigation prior to the signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6988. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, supporting House bill 4098, to make the United States Government-owned motor vehicle service a permanent branch of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6989. Also, petition of the Association of Ship Brokers and Agent, New York Produce Exchange, relative to the St. Lawrence seaway plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6990. Also, petition of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, expressing opposition to an income-tax law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6991. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., expressing opposition to any changes in the new Sugar Act which would increase the quota of beet sugar or tend to reduce the volume of cane sugar received and refined in the New York area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6992. Also, petition of the American Federation of Musicians Local 802, representing approximately 20,000 professional musicians, opposing any reduction in the appropriation for Work Projects Administration music projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6993. Also, petition of the United Neighborhood houses of New York, Inc., urging continuation and expansion of the National Youth Administration program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6994. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York State Retail Hardware Association, Syracuse, N. Y., concerning the Norris bill (S. 2605); to the committee on Agriculture.

6995. Also, petition of the Bricklayers' Union, Local No. 9, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 8615; to the Committee on Labor.

6996. Also, petition of Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the Harrison amendment to Senate bill 2009; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6997. Also, petition of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local Union No. 361, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6998. Also, petition of the United Neighborhood Houses of New York, Inc., New York City, concerning appropriation for

the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6999. Also, petition of Local 802, American Federation of Musicians, New York City, concerning appropriation for Work Projects Administration music projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7000. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, concerning the Walter-Logan bill (H. R. 6324); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7001. Also, petition of the Eastern New York State Advisory Board, General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., concerning national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7002. Also, petition of the Community Councils of the City of New York, Inc., concerning pending sugar legislation and for the protection of the jobs of the sugar-refinery workers of New York City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7003. Also, petition of Mrs. William Hays Lawrence, president of the Illuminati, cultural women's club of Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning sugar legislation and the protection of the jobs of the Brooklyn, N. Y., sugar-refinery workers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7004. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, New York City, favoring sugar legislation that will protect the jobs of the sugar-refinery workers of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7005. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local Union No. 361, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7006. Also, petition of the Wood, Fire, and Metal Lathers' International Union, Local No. 46, New York City, urging the passage of the Wagner-Steagall bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7007. Also, petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, New York City, concerning alien and sedition bills and war referendum; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7008. Also, petition of the Roosevelt Republican Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the importation of tropically refined sugar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7009. Also, petition of the Queens Village Democratic Club, Queens Village, N. Y., protesting against the importation of tropically refined sugar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7010. Also, petition of the North Lindenhurst Civic Association, Inc., Lindenhurst, Long Island, N. Y., urging continuation of the present Sugar Act to protect the jobs of the thousands employed in the Brooklyn sugar refineries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7011. Also, petition of the Lane Democratic Club, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the importation of tropically refined sugar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7012. Also, petition of the Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, urging defeat of Senate bill 2009 unless it contains the Harrington amendment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7013. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Montoursville, Pa., protesting against the shipment of war materials to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7014. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, requesting no change in the new Sugar Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7015. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, Local No. 20, Flushing, N. Y., urging support of House bill 4098 and other bills beneficial to employees in the Motor Vehicle Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7016. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, concerning the Walter-Logan bill (H. R. 6324); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7017. Also, petition of William Feinberg, secretary, Local 802, American Federation of Musicians, New York City, op-

posing any reduction in appropriation for Work Projects Administration music projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7018. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of G. Stanley Hamric, adjutant of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, at a post officers' area conference of posts of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, from Wheeling, Moundsville, McMechen, Weirton, Cameron, Hundred, New Martinsville, Wellsburg, Follansbee, Benwood, Pine Grove, Weston, Buckhannon, Clarksburg, Lumberport, West Union, Shinnston, Gassaway, Salem, Parkersburg, Spencer, Point Pleasant, Glenville, Middlebourne, Elizabeth, Sistersville, St. Marys, Grantsville, Pennsboro, Ripley, and Ravenswood, at Sistersville, W. Va., urging the passage of Senate bill 3060 or House bill 7618, for the acquiring of additional ground for the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7019. By Mr. SCHWERT: Resolution of Buffalo Lodge, No. 1071, International Association of Machinists, Buffalo, N. Y., expressing unanimous opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7020. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Blair County Central Labor Union, Altoona, Pa., advocating the passage of House bill 2001 over the President's veto; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7021. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, fourth annual conference, Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7022. Also, petition of the Automobile Dealers Association of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the proposed Patman bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7023. Also, petition of the Brentwood Mine and Mill Workers Union, Brentwood, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to United States Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7024. Also, petition of Philadelphia Bourse, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal sugar legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7025. Also, petition of the Utility Workers Organizing Committee, Bay City, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the antialien bills to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7026. Also, petition of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3331 and Senate bill 1032, establishing guarantees of collective bargaining in Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZēBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the ruler of the world's destiny, draw us closer, hour by hour, within the folds of the divine-human mystery of this Holy Week, with its consummate tragedy of Christ upon the cross, dying that we might live. Grant to each one of us the Christlike spirit with its youthful, noble ideals of service, with its genuine desire to help men and to give up many things for the common good, lest when life goes on, and the flame dies down, prudence usurp the throne of adventure, and mediocrity find complacency more comfortable than the challenge of a great enterprise.

God of our fathers, help us, we beseech Thee, to realize that though men may be made heroic by the plaudits of a